

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 7307. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella E. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 7308. A bill for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 7309. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3128. By Mr. BETTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Akron, N. Y., urging enactment of Senate bill 860 in order that the young men who are in training for service in defense of the country shall be protected from the influence of alcoholic beverages in canteens and territory surrounding military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3129. Also, petition of Clarence Grange, No. 892, Clarence, N. Y., urging favorable action on the Sheppard bill, Senate No. 860, to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors in or near military camps or naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3130. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of members of the Youth Fellowship of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Perry, Dallas County, Iowa, urging passage of legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3131. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 82 adult citizens of the United States and residents of the State of Pennsylvania, requesting members of the Senate and House of Representatives to keep the Sheppard bill (S. 860) from becoming law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3132. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Mrs. Earl Taylor, of Flora, Ill., signed by 16 residents of Clay County, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, which provides for the elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3133. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of various citizens of Ellensburg, Kittitas County, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3134. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of D. C. Williamson and 50 others of Axtell, Kans., petitioning the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, together with Congress assembled, to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or gift of all alcoholic beverages during the war; also, as citizens of a nation founded on Christian principles, requesting and petitioning the leaders of our Nation to regard the command of the Almighty Creator to cease from labor and all worldly activities on the Lord's Day, and that neither we nor our employees work on that day, that we may keep it holy, for thus only can He bless and help us as we recognize and obey His divine commands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3135. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, Pacific region, relative to proposal that all persons in any way connected with contracts for the national defense be relieved and exempted from State taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3136. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of the Baptist Church of Upland, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860, which provides for elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 18, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James H. Miers, D. D., minister, Fourth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts to Thee on this occasion, thanking Thee for the privilege of meeting in health and strength. We are here before Thee to represent this great country, to assist those who make its policies, and carry them out in the years and months to come. We ask that they may be given special wisdom, special breadth of vision, so that Thy will may be carried out through them in the policies of the country as a whole.

We pray for our men who are in the armed forces of America. We pray wherever they are that Thou wilt spread Thy wings over them, and underneath them may there be Thine everlasting arms.

We trust it is in Thy will to give us the victory for those forces, which we believe are the forces of righteousness now represented by us. Therefore, our God, we pray that Thou wilt make us worthy of the victory which we hope in time will come.

And now, as this great deliberative body meets together to consider the policies which will mean much for us and for the world, guide them we beseech Thee by the fullness of Thy Holy Spirit, and may all that they say or do be begun, and continued and ended in Thee. And to Thee we shall give the praise and the glory, world without end; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 25, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Lucas
Andrews	Davis	McCarran
Bailey	Downey	McFarland
Ball	Doxey	McKellar
Bankhead	Ellender	McNary
Barbour	George	Maloney
Bilbo	Gerry	Maybank
Bone	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Millikin
Brown	Gurney	Murdoch
Burton	Hayden	Murray
Butler	Hill	Norris
Byrd	Hughes	Nye
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Clark, Mo.	Lee	Radcliffe

Reed	Stewart	Tydings
Rosier	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh
Schwartz	Thomas, Utah	Wheeler
Shipstead	Truman	White
Smith	Tunnell	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOMINATIONS OF JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND MUNICIPAL COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the rule of the Committee on the Judiciary, I hereby give notice that on Thursday, July 2, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., in the Judiciary Committee room, hearings at which all interested persons may appear will be held on the following nominations:

Hon. William E. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. George P. Barse, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as chief judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Walter J. Casey, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice himself.

Hon. Brice Clagett, of Maryland, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. George C. Aukam, deceased.

Hon. Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Robert E. Mattingly, whose term has expired.

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Nathan Cayton, elevated.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of State and Agriculture (3), United States New York World's Fair Commission, Federal Security Agency (2), Federal Trade Commission, United States Civil Service Commission, and The National Archives, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Ocean Park, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of beverage alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Preston and Stafford, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Catonsville and Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish zones in which the sale of alcoholic beverages will be prohibited in areas used for military or naval purposes and adjacent areas; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. WHEELER):

A petition, numerous signed (transmitted by Maude C. Behner of the Montana Council of Churches, of sundry citizens of Billings, Mont., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to

the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2628) amending Public Law No. 873, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 21, 1940, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1526) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 25, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards for the Selective Service System;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain;

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. McNARY introduced a bill (S. 2629) to further amend section 3 of Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ELIMINATION OF USE OF SILVER IN THE ARTS

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of June 26, 1942, entitled "Silver Arts Uses To Be Eliminated as War Measure," which appears in the Appendix.]

AVIATION AS A WEAPON—ARTICLES BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky on the subject of aviation as a weapon, one from the New York Herald Tribune of June 19, 1942, and the other from the Washington Times-Herald of June 20, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN AND NELSON—ARTICLE FROM NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New Republic of June 29, 1942, entitled "Truman and Nelson," which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the

Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in conference with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], I have agreed that they might ask for the consideration of two or three bills; but I must insist that no considerable time be consumed in their consideration, because the bill I have in charge is an appropriation bill, and it must be passed with expedition, since the end of the fiscal year is approaching.

FREE-IMPORTATION PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 327, according certain privileges to members of the armed forces of various nations. I think, with merely a word of explanation, it will take practically no time at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President the joint resolution is recommended by the Treasury Department; it has had the unanimous support of the Committee on Finance, and is intended to permit the admission, free of tariff or other taxes, of articles which are sent to internees or those who have been detained in camps. It covers such things as trinkets, cigarettes, and articles of similar nature, which are intended for the personal use only of detained prisoners of war.

One provision carries out a treaty to which we are subscribers, a treaty made several years ago, dealing with the treatment of prisoners of war.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the able Senator whether the so-called obligation rests wholly on treaties. Are we bound by treaty to carry out provisions of this kind?

Mr. GEORGE. One provision is in pursuance of a treaty, the other is a reciprocal provision. Where like treatment is given Americans who may be interned or detained in any enemy country, we grant similar rights. It is based on reciprocal treatment of our citizens.

Mr. McNARY. How many cases would it cover?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to say. There are some German prisoners in this country, and there are some Japanese who are detained in the United States at this time. It is not a matter of very great consequence so far as the number is concerned, but received in small packages from the homeland are chocolate bars, for instance, or packages of cigarettes, articles which would bear a tax. The Treasury Department wishes to handle the matter without collecting the taxes.

It is a reciprocal arrangement, except to the extent that we are obligated by treaty to which we are parties.

Mr. McNARY. Are natives of the United States who are now detained in foreign countries accorded the same privileges in those countries proposed to be extended to foreigners detained here?

Mr. GEORGE. We are so advised, and where such treatment is not accorded, the obligation on our part will not attach.

Mr. McNARY. If it is wholly reciprocal, I should have no objection, but if it is one of the one-sided arrangements about which we hear so much, I am opposed to it.

Mr. GEORGE. It is reciprocal, except where there is a treaty with an enemy country to which we are parties covering the treatment of prisoners of war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM CUSTOMS DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7234, to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7234) to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement with reference to this bill similar to that I made relating to the joint resolution just passed.

The bill is recommended by the Treasury Department; it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance, and it is intended to cover principally the household and personal effects of American officers who have been evacuated to the United States, or have been ordered home. Under existing law they may send their personal effects into this country, but they must receive them within 1 year, or, if they have been transferred to a warehouse, they must receive them personally within 3 years. The bill is intended to permit the household and personal effects to be delivered to any agent or any member of the family of the American officer or citizen who is ordered to the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it include newly purchased household effects?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; only such household and personal effects as have been used for 1 year, not new articles; and it would not include articles imported for the purpose of sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill H. R. 7234 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGROUPING OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565, to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2565) to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 263), is amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and substituting the following: "Such representatives shall be presidents or first vice presidents of Federal Reserve banks and, beginning with the election for the term commencing March 1, 1943, shall be elected annually as follows: One by the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, Philadelphia, and Richmond, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Cleveland and Chicago, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, Dallas, and St. Louis, and one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Minneapolis, Kansas City, and San Francisco. In such elections each board of directors shall have one vote; and the details of such elections may be governed by regulations prescribed by the committee, which may be amended from time to time. An alternate to serve in the absence of each such representative shall likewise be a president or first vice president of a Federal Reserve bank and shall be elected annually in the same manner."

Sec. 2. The sixth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462b), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, upon the affirmative vote of not less than four of its members, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities or (2) by member banks in reserve cities or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities or (4) by all member banks; but the amount of the reserves required to be maintained by any such member bank as a result of any such change shall not be less than the amount of the reserves required by law to be maintained by such bank on the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 nor more than twice such amount."

Sec. 3. The ninth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 464), is amended by striking out the proviso thereof, so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"The required balance carried by a member bank with a Federal Reserve bank may, under the regulations and subject to such penalties as may be prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, be checked against and withdrawn by such member bank for the purposes of meeting existing liabilities."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and I

am advised that a similar bill has been unanimously reported to the House of Representatives by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Briefly, the bill slightly regroups the Federal Reserve banks which elect the members of the Open Market Committee. Under existing circumstances it happens that the Boston bank has not had a representative on the Federal Reserve Board. By the proposed regrouping that situation would be taken care of.

Second. It authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to change its reserve requirements in the three classes of banks, as they are classified by the Federal Reserve Board, banks in central reserve cities, in reserve cities, and the so-called country banks. Again it is a technical matter that will enable the Board better to expedite its handling of reserve requirements in the expedition of Government financing.

Third. Because of a decision of a district court in New York, an unexpected liability upon officers of Federal Reserve banks was imposed. The Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department and those of us in the Senate and the House who are familiar with such things feel that this liability is rather unfair. It arose in what is known as the Penney case. There are conflicting decisions. The effect of the amendment would be to remove such possible liability in the future. It would not affect existing situations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there was so much disturbance in the Senate I found difficulty in hearing the explanation made by the able Senator from Michigan. The bill comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I understand it was reported favorably unanimously?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke to me about this bill. He is called from the city at this time. Yesterday he told me that the bill conforms to his views. I think there was some modification made in the bill from its original pattern.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was consulted before the bill was introduced, and his ideas, as well as mine and those of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the committee, were included within the bill. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the bill is entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Ohio; he is anxious to have it passed.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that to be so from what he stated yesterday. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. BROWN. Perhaps it would be well, Mr. President, for me to explain the bill briefly by sections.

Section 1 of the bill provides for regrouping the Federal Reserve banks for the purpose of electing their five representatives on the Federal Open Market Committee. At present one representative of the Federal Open Market Committee is elected by the Boston and New York Reserve banks but in practice the

Boston Reserve Bank has never had a representative serve as a member of the committee but only as an alternate to the President of the New York Reserve Bank, who has served continuously. The effect of the change in existing law made by section 1 of the bill would be to require that a representative of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York be a member of the committee at all times, and the regrouping provided for by such section also makes it possible for the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston to serve from time to time as a member of the committee, as do the presidents of the other Reserve banks. Your committee believes that it is desirable in the public interest that the changes contemplated by section 1 of the bill be made.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities within the limits of the present law without necessarily making a change in the reserve requirements of member banks in reserve cities. Under the present law the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may change the requirements as to the maintenance of reserves by banks located in reserve and central reserve cities or by member banks located elsewhere, but it may not change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing those of member banks in reserve cities. In order to provide the necessary flexibility with respect to reserve requirements, especially in connection with heavy withdrawals of deposits from banks throughout the country in order to meet Federal tax liabilities and to prevent a depressing effect upon the Government security market as a result of such withdrawals. It is felt that the Board of Governors should be empowered to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing the reserve requirements of other member banks.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act by repealing the provision prohibiting member banks of the Federal Reserve System from making new loans or paying dividends while their reserves are deficient. There is retained, however, in the law the existing statutory authority of the Board of Governors to prescribe penalties for deficiencies in reserves. It is believed that the retention of the penalty provision will be a sufficient deterrent against deficiencies in reserves, as the penalties may be varied from time to time as circumstances may require under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors.

A favorable report on the bill has been received from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and also from the Treasury Department. In a letter to the chairman of the committee by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell, it was also stated that the Bureau

of the Budget had advised the Treasury Department that the bill was in accord with the President's program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 2665 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OFFICER PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. There are several important naval bills upon the calendar. The consideration of one of them is to follow the pending bill when it shall have been disposed of. There is one bill, however, which must be signed by the President before June 30. Ninety-one naval officers will be retired unless the bill is signed before that date. The consideration of the measure will take but a few minutes, and, with the indulgence of the Senator from Nevada, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2592, Calendar No. 1553.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2592) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as the House bill is identical with the Senate bill, I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. The purpose of the bill is to suspend existing provisions of law relating to the permanent promotion of all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the involuntary retirement of such officers by reason of failure of selection. In addition, the bill amends other features of present laws in order that they may be better and more efficiently administered.

Experience gained under present operating conditions has demonstrated that it is impractical and inadvisable, during the present war, to continue to administer Navy officer personnel laws as they relate to permanent promotions and involuntary retirements or discharges.

During normal peacetime the selection boards are composed of officers serving at sea in the various type forces, as well as those employed on shore. The committee are of the opinion that it is inadvisable to withdraw such officers from their important assignments during war in order to permit them sitting as members of selection boards. Operating conditions during wartime, with attendant casualties, make it impossible to determine the actual number of commis-

sioned officers upon which a correct legal distribution of line officers in the several grades can be made, as required by existing law. Furthermore, due to the uncertain status—missing, captured, dead, and so forth—of officers, it is equally impossible to determine the dates upon which vacancies in grades may occur.

The bill provides, in brief, for the suspension of laws governing permanent promotions in the Coast Guard, Navy, and Marine Corps during the continuance of the existing war and until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which such war is terminated. It preserves in general the right of permanent promotion to officers already selected for such promotion and to those who have otherwise become eligible for promotion or advancement. The only exception to this would be in the case of an officer, who, since becoming eligible for promotion, has committed himself in such a manner as to indicate that he should not be advanced in rank. The bill contains appropriate provisions to insure that the proper number of officers of the rank of rear admiral become entitled to the pay of the upper half.

The committee are advised that the Navy Department intends to use the selective system in connection with the administration of this bill but does not contemplate the use of regularly constituted statutory boards as provided in existing law. It is felt, however, that some form of selection established by regulations is necessary in order that personnel whose records indicate a high degree of ability will receive first consideration.

I ask for the present consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 7160 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2592 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign House bill 7160, which was just passed by the Senate, during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR PERFORMANCE OF ANNUAL LABOR ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6295.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6295) to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I shall ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran] to explain the bill to the Senate,

as it largely affects mining industries in his State. The bill has the endorsement not only of himself but of his colleague and of the Representative from that State.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in explanation of the measure called up by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I wish to say that throughout the country, and especially the mining sections the Government, for war purposes, has either instituted condemnation proceedings or has taken possession of large tracts of the open public domain. In many of the tracts taken over for war activities by the Government there exist mining claims of various character, both lode-mining and placer-mining claims, which have in the past been located by legitimate locators, and have been held, and the annual work thereon done pursuant to law from year to year. Now that the Government has taken over these tracts, the owners of the mining claims are prohibited from doing the annual assessment work because of war activities in the areas.

The purpose of the bill is to make it possible for the ownership to continue in the locators of the mining claims and to suspend the obligation of doing the annual assessment work for the period during which the Government is occupying the premises and for 1 year thereafter. The purpose of the bill is simply to carry out the authority of the law with reference to assessment work on mining claims, but to permit those who have mining claims within territory taken over by the Government for war purposes to be relieved of doing the annual assessment work.

Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6295) to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION OF HOLDERS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR CERTAIN LOSSES

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of Senate bill 2599, Calendar 1546.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the same understanding may prevail, that if there is any controversy or threatened controversy with respect to the measure it will have to go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Murdock]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2599) authorizing the Secretary of War to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of use of the public lands for war purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment to strike out all after the

enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That whenever use for war purposes of the public domain or other property owned by or under the control of the United States prevents its use for grazing, persons holding grazing permits or licenses and persons whose grazing permits or licenses have been or will be canceled because of such use shall be paid out of the funds appropriated or allocated for such project such amounts as the head of the department or agency so using the lands shall determine to be fair and reasonable for the losses suffered by such persons as a result of the use of such lands for war purposes. Such payments shall be deemed payment in full for such losses. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to create any liability not now existing against the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the title of the bill is rather enticing in its composition. I should like to have the Senator from Utah explain the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, this is a bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFarland] for himself and in behalf of seven or eight other western Senators. I think the Senator from Arizona conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and also with the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. Since the declaration of war vast tracts of land in a number of Western States have been taken by the Government for war purposes. As a result of the taking of these lands for war purposes, in numerous instances livestock operations which have been carried on for many years, even prior to the Forest Reserve Act, prior to the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act, and since the enactment of those laws, have been disrupted.

Under the Taylor Grazing Act and the forest reserve law permittees and licensees who are allowed to use the public lands for grazing purposes do not acquire a vested interest in the lands. All they acquire is a permit or license to graze livestock on the lands. As a general rule, the permit extends for a period of 10 years.

The grazing permit is an integral part of the livestock operation. To take away from a livestock operator the right to use the land for grazing purposes results in just as much damage as would the taking of his fee-title land. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the Grazing Service, and the Forest Service have agreed that under present law the damages resulting from such taking cannot be compensated; that is, the permittee cannot be compensated for loss of use of the grazing lands on which he holds a permit or license. The result in many instances in the West, especially in the States of Arizona and New Mexico, is that scores of livestock operators have been put out of business and forced to sell their livestock. As a further result there is a very serious depreciation in the value of their fee-title land, such as their farms and ranches. Under the existing law they can be paid no compensa-

tion. All the bill proposes to do is to authorize the payment by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, of reasonable compensation for the damage suffered by livestock operators.

In the past few weeks delegations of livestock men from the West, together with State land officials from the Western States, have conferred with the Federal departments and agencies on this question. They have unanimously come to the agreement that a very serious injustice is being done to those who are forced out of business and damaged as a result of the taking of the land for war purposes.

In the hearings before the Public Lands Committee there were present representatives of the War Department and of the Navy Department, a representative of the Forest Service, and a representative of the Grazing Service, who unanimously agreed that a serious injustice was resulting, and one which should be compensable. They unanimously agreed that the bill should be passed, granting authority to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to compensate reasonably livestock producers for damages sustained. I hope there will be no opposition to the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear and terse explanation of the bill. I think it is a worthy measure. I have no objection to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], I should like to make a brief statement with reference to the pending bill.

In my State the War Department took over 1,000,000 acres of land. On that land were hundreds of stock owners, many of whom had possibly 160 acres of land in fee simple, and perhaps 20,000 acres leased from the Federal Government. The leased land was of great value to the stock growers. As stated by the Senator from Utah, when the Government took over the land it allowed only for the land held in fee simple, plus the improvements. In many instances the Government has taken over land and improvements, and forced the stock grower to look elsewhere for pasture, or to sell his stock. The bill was proposed with the idea of compensating that class of citizens.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The junior Senator from New Mexico, who has just spoken, was also a co-sponsor of the bill. I am sorry that his name did not appear on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 2599 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate

holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes."

CARL L. JONES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2014, Calendar 1374.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2014) for the relief of Carl L. Jones.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] the bill was reported from the Claims Committee by me, and has been on the calendar for several weeks. It involves a claim growing out of personal injuries resulting from an accident in the operation of a C. C. C. truck.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I have discussed this matter with the members of the committee. I ask that the committee amendment be rejected, and that the bill be passed as it originally came over from the House.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIVERSION OF WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2604, Calendar 1566, a bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the diversion of the waters of the Republican River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2604), granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact not later than June 1, 1945, providing for an equitable division and apportionment among the said States of the waters of the Republican River and all of its tributaries above its junction

with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, while so employed shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

LIMITATION OF WELL SPACING IN OIL FIELDS—CONSERVATION ORDER M-68

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret to say that because of the fact that the bill which is the unfinished business before the Senate must become law before Wednesday next, I shall be unable to yield further, after yielding to the Senator from Illinois.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding for a few brief observations relative to Conservation Order M-68.

Some time ago the Petroleum Coordinator's Office adopted a regulation, known as Conservation Order M-68, limiting well spacing in the oil fields of this country to 40 acres of surface area. This order has seriously crippled the oil industry in the State of Illinois and other States throughout the Union. Especially has this order injured and impaired the independent oil operators throughout the country.

Before this spacing regulation was issued by the Petroleum Coordinator in December of last year, Illinois was producing approximately 387,000 barrels of oil a day. In the short space of 6 months thereafter, the production of oil had declined to 274,000 barrels a day. Thus we see a decline of approximately 113,000 barrels of oil a day in the State of Illinois alone.

It should be remembered in connection with the oil operations in Illinois that 81 percent of the new fields in Illinois have been discovered by independent operators, and not by the big companies. As a result of M-68 these independent operators have practically gone out of business; and yet without them the oil development in Illinois would have seriously lagged.

Without the independent oil operator, taking the chances which he takes in wildcatting in every new oil field which is developed, we should not have the oil production in the Nation which we have at this particular moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, is not the purpose of the order to which the Senator is referring to put the small independent operators, who did the exploration work, out of business in the interest of the

large established oil companies? At least, that is the inevitable effect of it, whether it is the purpose or not.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his statement. I am forced to agree, much as I dislike to do so. The big oil companies can stand by and wait, because of the tremendous reserve capital that they have. They can do their exploration work later, while the independent fellow, who is operating on small financial capital, must go out of business as a result of order M-68.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Coordinator's office is now asking for 325,000 barrels of oil a day from Illinois and is getting only 274,000 as a result of failure to change well spacing in that and surrounding States. Illinois is only a short distance from the eastern seaboard. Had the wells in Illinois been permitted to operate without the interference of order M-68, there is a serious question in my mind whether the recent order directing the big pipe line to be constructed from Texas to Illinois would have been necessary. That may be a rather farfetched statement, but I cannot reach any other conclusion. It should be remembered that Illinois is one of the Nation's greatest oil-producing States. It should also be remembered that the big pipe line will end in the richest oil section of our State. From this terminus branch lines will be constructed to various sites along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in order that they can barge this oil to the eastern seaboard. Donald Nelson thought the pipe line an unnecessary expenditure. He wanted to use the steel and other materials that will go into the Texas-Illinois pipe line for planes, ships, and tanks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As strengthening the conclusion of the Senator from Illinois, the representative of the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, who appeared before the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee which was investigating the oil situation, in justifying the necessity for this big pipe line from Longview, Tex., to the vicinity of Salem, Ill., did so on the ground that the production in Illinois was falling off very materially, and that Illinois could not supply the field, in spite of the fact that the falling off of production in Illinois is unquestionably caused by the very order the Petroleum Coordinator himself had issued.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the conclusion of the Senator from Missouri is incapable as to the reason for the failure to be able to produce the necessary oil in Illinois, as it is well able to produce it. Had the independent operators been able to go on with their discovery of oil in Illinois, there is no question about the amount we could produce without destroying the reserve.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I desired to call to the attention of the Senator is the fact that it is the official explanation of the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, in urging that this pipe line be constructed from Longview

to the vicinity of Salem, which the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator has always favored, that the necessity for it has been because of the falling off of production in Illinois. Of course, they do not emphasize that they themselves are responsible for the falling off in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have discussed this question upon many occasions with various independent operators in my State. I am frank to say that in the beginning, when they came to me and laid this situation before me, I was somewhat skeptical of their premise. The more I studied the conditions about which they complained, and the more I listened to these men, the more I was convinced that the small independent operator was being driven out of business as the result of Order M-68. I was also convinced that these men were attempting to have Order M-68 amended for patriotic reasons, primarily, and, secondly, for the purpose of saving themselves.

It is well to say in passing that as a result of the continued activities on the part of the independent oil operators in my State, there was a recent modification of Order M-68, but the modification does not go far enough. It will only result in the drilling of a few additional wells.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing an amendment to H. R. 6999, which will permit all oil operators to drill oil wells to a depth of not to exceed 3,300 feet, with a further provision that oil wells may be drilled only with equipment that has already been fabricated. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Commerce, which is handling H. R. 6999, will give this amendment most serious consideration, and that witnesses from Secretary Ickes' office and independent oil operators in Illinois, Indiana, and other sections will be brought before the committee in order that they may testify and present their case to this honorable committee.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Nevada for giving me this time.

I now present the amendment and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LUCAS, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6999) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill now pending, when it came to the Senate, carried

\$1,058,951,660. The amount of the increase recommended by the Senate committee, that is, the net over-all increase, is \$14,620,966. Senators will note, as we go along, that reductions have been made in various items. The sum which I have last mentioned is the net increase.

The amount of the bill, as reported to the Senate, and as it is now before the Senate, is \$1,073,572,626. The amount of the appropriation for the current year, which will expire next Tuesday, the last day of June, is \$1,261,039,498. The regular and supplemental estimates, as furnished by the Bureau of the Budget for 1943, amount to \$1,177,593,741.

The Senate will note that the committee report recommends less than the Budget Bureau estimate authorized. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1943 by \$104,021,115 and under the appropriation for 1942 by \$187,466,872. So, the Senate will note that the committee recommends less than was appropriated for the current year.

Under the Department of Labor the Senators will note several amendments, and I think it best to note them as we go along, as the items are being read by the clerk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.) Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments proposed by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 18, after the word "motortrucks", to insert "purchase (including exchange) at a cost not to exceed \$1,500, of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for the official use of the Secretary of Labor"; and on page 3, line 9, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "\$191,030" and insert "\$192,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, after the word "field", to strike out "\$932,500" and insert "\$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$930,735" and insert "\$975,635."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 8, line 13, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$317,310" and insert "\$345,310", and in line 14, before the word "may", to strike out "\$272,557" and insert "\$296,606."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Miscellaneous and contingent expenses", on page 17, line 7, after "401-409", to strike out "\$1,730,884" and insert "\$1,775,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian Conservation Corps", on page 19, line 13, after the word

"war", to insert "or the Civil Aeronautics Administration", and in line 14, after the word "Departments", to insert "or agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Youth Administration", on page 25, line 15, after the word "of" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "17" and insert "16."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 9, after the word "education", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000; to provide continuance of part-time employment for needy students in schools below the college level to enable such persons to continue their education, \$3,000,000; in all \$7,000,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with reference to the committee amendment just stated, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether that means a reduction of a million dollars?

Mr. McCARRAN. It means a reduction of a million dollars from the amount allowed by the House, the House having allowed \$5,000,000. We reduced that item to \$4,000,000, and allowed \$3,000,000 to provide for continuance of part-time employment for needy students in schools below the college level, in order to permit such students to continue their education.

Mr. BYRD. As a matter of fact, the net result is an increase of \$2,000,000; is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an increase of \$2,000,000; that is correct.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, on page 9, under the heading "Maternal and child welfare," I notice an item of \$375,795 for "supplies; services; equipment; newspapers, books of reference, and periodicals." Can the Senator from Nevada tell me what that item covers?

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator object to letting us proceed in the regular order to consider first the committee amendments? The item to which the Senator refers is not a committee amendment. I suggest that, if satisfactory to the Senator, after we have considered the committee amendments we revert to the item to which he has referred.

Mr. GERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 26, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after the numeral "2", to strike out "\$3,275,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 21, after the words "fiscal year", to strike out "1941" and insert "1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education and training, defense workers (national defense)", on page 43, line 9, before the word "who", to strike out "youth" and insert "persons", and in line 16, after the words "by the", to strike out "Director of the Labor Division of the War Production Board, or by such other officer as may succeed to the functions of

such Director" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, after the words "by the", to strike out "War Production Board" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 51, line 12, after the words "field work", to strike out "\$8,101,050, of which not to exceed \$142,212 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Pay, etc., commissioned officers, Public Health Service'" and insert "\$15,000,000, of which (1) not to exceed \$142,212 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Pay, etc., commissioned officers, Public Health Service', and (2) not to exceed \$195,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Traveling expenses, Federal Security Agency', for the traveling expenses of the personnel of the Division of Venereal Diseases, which shall be in addition to the sum contained in such appropriation for such Division."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at that point let me remark that the appropriation bills previously passed this year have carried a reduction of 12 percent in the amounts available for travel expenses of most of the departments. Is any such provision contained in this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. No such provision is contained in it, for the reason that both the House and the Senate committee gave only the amounts which we thought were absolutely indispensable to carrying out the functions and work of the respective departments. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that with respect to the pending bill, and especially that portion of the bill which addresses itself to the Federal Security Agency, we have, by laws enacted in years past, authorized the services involved to function largely, as I choose to term it, on wheels. In other words, the rendering of those services must be interspersed and spread over the entire country. The performance of such service requires many traveling agents, many traveling representatives, many solicitors, many representatives of all kinds; and when the committee undertakes to cut down the appropriations for travel pay we are confronted with the problem of how to reduce the appropriations for travel pay and travel allowances and yet at the same time have the services function properly.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator inform us whether the committee has proposed an increase or a decrease in the appropriations for travel expenses, as compared with the amounts appropriated for such purposes for the previous year?

Mr. McCARRAN. There has been a decrease, I may say.

Mr. BYRD. A decrease?

Mr. McCARRAN. Generally speaking, there has been a decrease.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator have before him information as to the amount of the decrease?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the information at hand, but I shall try to obtain it for the Senator in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment proposed by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 21, after the word "to", to insert "conduct independently or to"; on page 55, line 7, after the name "Surgeon General", to insert "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes", in line 10, after the word "hospitals", to strike out "located not more than 300 miles from ocean or Gulf coast", and in line 11, after the word "procure", to strike out "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 63, line 16, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "\$2,467,670" and insert "\$7,467,670."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question about that item. The proposed \$5,000,000 increase in that item, as I understand it, is to be used by the United States Employment Service, taken over by the Federal Government last December, for a survey of manpower requested by the Manpower Commission; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; that is not correct.

Mr. BALL. The item is a nonrecurring item, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is. Let me explain a little further. The item came to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations during the time when the bill was in the hands of the committee. It came by way of a supplemental estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, with a letter of transmittal from the President asking for \$19,500,000 to carry out the services of the employment agency. The item was very strenuously advocated by Governor McNutt, at the head of the Federal Security Agency, and by the Bureau of the Budget. My attention is called to the fact that Governor McNutt is now the head of the Manpower Commission.

The object and aim of the estimate of \$19,500,000, taken in its entirety, was that a survey of the entire country be made from which we could determine our manpower available for war purposes. In other words, we have authorized the registration of nearly all the manpower of the country up to the age of 65 years. The question is where that manpower fits in. We know that men from 45 to 65 years of age will scarcely be accepted for the regular run of service in the Army; but through all the classes there must be those who can serve their country in some way and who, indeed, are anxious to serve in every possible way. So the object was to make a survey of the available manpower and then a survey of the places where certain classes of labor are required, and, if possible, bring the two together.

The committee in passing upon the matter believed that many of the side issues, so-called, of the Budget estimate could be left out; and instead of recom-

mending \$19,500,000, we recommended only \$5,000,000 for the purposes of the proposed survey which is to register and catalog, so to speak, all the labor available throughout the country.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will yield further, referring to the item of \$79,650,000, in line 24, which, as I understand, is to cover the administrative cost of both unemployment compensation, which is paid by grants to the States, and the United States Employment Service—

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, the Budget estimate of \$19,500,000 additional included \$6,000,000 for the survey for which the committee allowed \$5,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. The other \$13,500,000 was largely to supplement the funds of the Employment Service; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Let me say in full answer to the Senator that I have before me a copy of the estimate, which is broken down as follows:

I. Nation-wide occupational inventory, \$6,000,000.

It was for that item that the committee allowed \$5,000,000. Under that head comes:

Classification of skills, interviewing persons with necessary skills, filing of questionnaires.

All that comes under the heading "Nation-wide occupational inventory."

Mr. BALL. That item is a nonrecurring one, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; the item is a nonrecurring one.

II. Collection of labor-market information, \$700,000.

The committee believed that, for the time being, at least, we could get along without that.

III. Farm placement, \$2,759,173.

The committee believed, in view of the conditions prevailing throughout the country, that we could get along, for the time being, without that item.

Under the farm-placement item comes the "Location and referral of farm workers." We believed that could be deferred because there are other agencies that are working along the same line.

No. IV of the break-down is:

Additional placement and registration activities, \$10,040,827.

The committee believed that that item could be deferred, and we did not allow it. What is more we cut down the \$6,000,000 request to \$5,000,000.

Mr. BALL. I have been investigating the appropriation for the current year in the regular appropriation bill and, as I understand, for both these services there was an appropriation of sixty-two and a half million dollars, which was supplemented last January by a deficiency appropriation of \$10,000,000, giving them seventy-two and a half million dollars to operate the two services, plus \$3,100,000 paid by all the States, which gave them \$75,600,000, or about \$4,000,000 less than is allowed for next year in this bill. But, as I understand, the work of the Employment Service has increased tremendously since war was declared, and it has actually spent since January 1, for the

6 months, \$21,000,000. Those are the figures I get from the Service. Of this \$79,650,000 in the bill, the unemployment compensation grants to the States as budgeted already for the first 6 months are \$20,456,000, which would make the total for the year going to unemployment compensation about \$41,000,000, which if subtracted from \$79,650,000, will leave about \$38,650,000 for the United States Employment Service, which actually means operating it for the year on a basis of about \$3,350,000 less than the basis on which they have been operating for the last 6 months.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true, but it was the opinion of the committee that, in view of the fact that Congress is practically always in session, if they have legitimate reason to believe that there would be a deficiency they could come before the Congress and request an additional amount.

Let me say in this regard—and I think the Senator will agree with me—that in view of the fact that we are passing through a difficult war period and are looking for every dollar we can possibly find we must curtail and say to this Service, "You are compelled to curtail your activity just as much as possible, yet at the same time carry on your functions as efficiently as is possible." That was one of the thoughts uppermost in the minds of the committee when they passed on this and did not allow \$19,500,000, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BALL. Knowing the tremendously increased load placed on the Employment Service, and I consider it was a mistake for the Federal Government to take it over, because it worked better when it was operated in conjunction with the State unemployment compensation setups, but since December 7, when all placements in war industries have been channeled through the United States Employment Service so as to carry out the directives of the W. P. B. and the Manpower Commission and other bodies, their load has tremendously increased, I question whether it is wise actually to give it less money for the next year than it has operated under for the past 6 months.

Of course, if the Senator is taking the position that they can go on at about the present level, and then if they need a deficiency can come in later, that is a different situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Speaking for myself and not for the committee I think if we were to appropriate \$30,000,000 in place of \$19,000,000 we would find that it would be absorbed in some way or other. That is the reason I take the other view of it; in other words, I believe in curtailing, and then let them come in and show a reason for an additional amount if an additional amount is needed. I think as we go on those who are seeking work in this country will find work; they have found it to a large extent already. While this agency may have rendered very valuable service to the country; at the same time, it seems to me that their burdens and their obligations will be lessened as time goes on. We can only judge it from that standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 63, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 16, to insert:

No part of the appropriations contained herein under the heading "Social Security Board" shall be expended for the salary of any person who directly or indirectly is receiving compensation for services from any person, corporation, or association employing any person enrolled under the Social Security Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 73, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "\$2,128,130" and insert "\$2,174,130."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 75, line 15, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$215,060" and insert "\$230,060"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$70,000"; in line 16, after the word "for", to strike out "services of referees at a rate of"; and in line 17, after the words "per day", to insert "and expenses of referees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill. Has the Senator from Nevada an amendment to offer?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think there are one or two committee amendments that have not as yet been completed. Will the Senator defer offering his amendment until the committee amendments are acted upon?

Mr. BALL. I thought it was announced by the Chair that the committee amendments had been completed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have an amendment, which I desire to offer and of which notice was given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

Loans to students in technical and professional fields (national defense): To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, as follows:

Loans: For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance, and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by said Chairman, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized hereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the

duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor, \$7,500,000: *Provided*, That in case it shall be found that any payment to any such college, university, or public or college-connected agency is in excess of the needs thereof for the purposes hereof, refund of such excess shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount thereof credited to this appropriation. Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus \$25 per month and not exceeding a total of \$500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities, or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled. The foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in the administration of the foregoing program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,500 for actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education, \$100,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in this amendment I am very much interested; it was submitted to my subcommittee and also to the full committee. Today the Selective Service organization of the Army is rightfully and necessarily, in my judgment, authorizing deferment of young men who are taking special courses in schools such as instruction in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine, including veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and like courses. When they have completed their studies, they will be of great service to the armed forces of the country.

When a student is taking special work, or devoting his entire time or majoring in work in those particular sciences, he is rightfully deferred until he completes his studies. The reason for that is that the Army requires men who are qualified along those lines.

There is great demand today for doctors in the Army; in fact, the Army is going to be exceedingly short of doctors. There is great demand today for veterinarians in the Army, and we are going to be short of them. There is great

demand today for chemists in the Army, because the war is to a large extent a chemical war. There is large demand in the Army for those skilled in these various lines of work.

We are expending much money along other lines, and it is my thought that this country could do no better than appropriate a sum so that when qualified young men have reached the stage in their education where they may matriculate as freshmen, or become sophomores or juniors or seniors in a college from which they can get a degree in one of these courses, the Government can say to them, "We want you to pursue your courses, and if you find yourselves without funds or without means to pay your way in pursuing the work, we will make you a loan of not to exceed \$500 for any one calendar year, and we will make you successive loans, from the freshman year to the senior year, not to exceed \$500 for any one calendar year, in order that you may pursue your courses and become qualified to serve your country in the activities to which you have devoted your energies." It will be with the understanding that the student signs an obligation to repay the Government, through his institution, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent. If the student is called into the military service of the United States, the obligation will be entirely liquidated.

The Department of Education estimated that it would require \$10,000,000, and that that was a proper appropriation for this worthy work. The committee felt that \$7,500,000 would be sufficient, and I believe that with the appropriation of that amount we can do a splendid work in aiding in the education of young men and young women in this country in skills in which they can serve their country, in places where the country is calling for service, and will be calling for service in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has referred to the great need of the Army for doctors, dentists, and pharmacists. I should like to point out that the Army has priority in requiring the services of those who have skill in those professions, but that there is a very serious condition among some of our civilian populations due to the lack of a sufficient number of doctors, dentists, and pharmacists. The situation is particularly acute in the rural areas. I have been advised that in my own State, in some eight or nine rural counties, the population of which is very sparse, there is not a single active physician. Certainly such a provision as that advocated by the Senator, which will enable young men and young women to be trained in these skills, is absolutely essential if we are adequately to protect the health and lives of the civilian population, as well as provide adequate medical treatment for those in the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I merely add that the activity of the National Youth Administration

in the rural areas in training young people is one of the greatest works being done in South Carolina.

I should also like to say that that activity has made it possible for many a poor boy and girl to get an education through loans and to carry on, as otherwise he or she never would have been able to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. Let it be understood, however, that the money would not be expended under the National Youth Administration. It would be disbursed under the Department of Education of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is not clear to me whether the money is to be paid back or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. The recipient will obligate himself to pay it back with interest at two and a half percent, but if he is taken into the military service during his course of study, then the obligation will be liquidated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, if I may, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I see the Senator now present who had asked me to have a quorum called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the order directing the calling of the roll is vacated.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 704. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authorities, all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Some time ago we adopted the provision in the bill having to do with the National Youth Administration. I overlooked a promise I had made to the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that I would defer that until the last of the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. We will let it go for the present. The Senator has another amendment to offer, I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall insist on the committee amendments being disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been disposed of, have they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall object to any being taken up out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the appropriation for the Department of Labor for carrying on its safety work in war industries. The Department had \$200,000 available for the current fiscal year, and the appropriation was cut by the House to \$150,000. With war industries expanding so rapidly, and new and green employees being hired, I think this safety work is extremely important, and that cutting it down at this time is simply shortsighted economy. I know that in 59 industries in Minnesota this program in a year has reduced the accident frequency from 36 per million man-hours to 27. Most of the work is actually done by safety engineers of large companies who donate their time, and the only expense to the Department is its full-time regional supervisors to coordinate the work.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that this matter was fully discussed before the committee. The Department asked for an additional \$50,000. The estimate was for \$200,000. The Department had \$200,000 for the current year. The House cut it to \$150,000. It was the judgment of the committee that the Department could get along with \$150,000 for this purpose.

Mr. President, again I come back to the same story that might be repeated with respect to every item in the bill. We cut these items with the greatest of reluctance, with the realization that perhaps such cut might impair the service to some extent.

Let me say to the Senate that with the demand for money which is being made every day for war activities to defend the country, I am sorry to say that we shall, before the war is over, have to curtail a great deal more in the matter of appropriation of money for various Government organizations. So, with respect to the service in question, however meritorious it may be—and the service performed by the Department in this respect is meritorious—the committee thought best to leave in the bill the figure which was fixed by the House. That is the position taken by the committee, and the Senator having the bill in charge cannot now yield.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that the \$200,000 was spent by the Department of Labor in actually

supervising the work of volunteer safety engineers all over the country, a work worth several million dollars, and that this cut of \$50,000 will cripple the program to a much greater extent than the amount would indicate, at a time when our war industries are expanding very rapidly, with green employees, and often with green management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it—

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the amendment on page 37, after line 14, providing for \$7,500,000, which was agreed to a moment ago, there is in line 2 the following language with respect to loans to students:

To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities.

I assume students in institutions granting the regular liberal arts college degrees would be eligible for such loans?

Mr. McCARRAN. If their work were preparatory to one of these courses.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the understanding?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. That answers my question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to that portion of the bill pertaining to the National Youth Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] desires to oppose this proposal, and I promised that I would give him the opportunity to present his statement in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that all committee amendments have been agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee now desire to present any opposition to that portion of the bill dealing with the National Youth Administration?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not under any obligation one way or the other to make any motion about it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, fairness is fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has just stated that the bill is open to further amendment, and that if there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the

amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask the Senator from Tennessee if he desires to make any motion with respect to the National Youth Administration portion of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the fact that we were for days considering these matters before the committee, it seems to me that the able Senator from Tennessee—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not going to quibble about the matter. I have not made any motion with respect to the National Youth Administration. It is not my purpose to do so at this time. The Senator can proceed in any way he likes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the language beginning with "For all necessary expenses", through "\$500,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed \$25,000 as follows:

For pay, subsistence, medical service, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses; burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding \$50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital authorized to treat such patient, \$48,499,288.

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, \$28,030,512.

The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, roads equipment, or boats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I did not clearly hear the amendment as it was

read. Will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I propose to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have the amendment again stated?

Mr. HUGHES. No, Mr. President; if the Senator from Nevada will explain it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House eliminated any appropriation for the continuation of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It is not necessary for me to say to the Senate that one of the early activities in legislation of the present administration was to establish the Civilian Conservation Corps. The aim and object in creating that corps was that we might take from the highways and byways and out of the alleys and streets of congested cities young men 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of age and give them an opportunity to learn to do something with their hands. We created the Civilian Conservation Corps and gave opportunity to millions of boys throughout the length and breadth of this land which they had never had before. Young men who up to that time really believed that their country was bounded on one side by the Hudson and on the other side by the East River learned that it was bounded on one side by the Pacific and on the other by the Atlantic. They learned the vast expanse of territory and the vast resources which existed between those two great oceans. They learned from actual observation that they had a country which was worth living in and worth dying for. There were enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps several million young men who thereafter had a year or more of training in civilian conservation work. To put an estimate on the work they did in dollars and cents would be beyond the ability of anyone. Those young men went onto the plains, they went out into the forests, they went to the little streams in the mountains and built impounding dams and reservoirs; they built roads; they cleared away trees; they built facilities of all kinds throughout the entire country.

Moreover, through the years of its existence the Civilian Conservation Corps has proved itself to be one of the most-effective fire-fighting agencies the country has ever had. When one of these young men of 17, 18, or 19 years of age is sent out with a group of his fellows to meet the onslaught of fire, he is fearless. He is trained to meet it, and he does effective work. That is not conjecture; it is not theory; it has actually been proved.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has been very much curtailed in many respects. Today in the Civilian Conservation Corps there are not only young men of the ages of 17, 18, and 19, but there are 15,000 ex-service men who fought in the former war. It may be asked how they happened to engage in Civilian Conservation Corps work. When the bonus marchers came to Washington some years ago the President saw fit to afford them the benefits of the nearby Civilian Conservation Corps camps. From that nucleus the participation of ex-service men grew until today approximately 15,000 ex-service men who fought

for their country in the former war are being taken care of and are performing a certain amount of work in the open, for which they are paid something to sustain themselves and their dependents. As I say, they are in the open, where they can look up at the sun and have a realization that there is something more in life than merely existing in some institution. They have the realization that they can do something at least partially to earn the money which is paid them.

When the bill passed the House it contained no provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps. I have before me a communication from Governor McNutt, who is now the head of the Civilian Conservation Corps, submitting a breakdown statement showing that \$17,000,000 would be required to liquidate the Civilian Conservation Corps. Governor McNutt attaches the following statement to his letter to me:

For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of War to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all the property, of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps, from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942," not exceeding \$17,000,000.

The break-down for that amount was presented to me. The items are:

Travel of enrollees, \$2,400,000.
Pay and subsistence of enrollees, \$5,000,000.

Salary of personnel and expenses relative to their employment, \$7,000,000.

Transportation and storage of supplies, \$2,600,000.

I mention that only to show that it is not a matter to be lightly dealt with. The \$500,000 allowed by the House to liquidate the agency would not accomplish anything. As a matter of fact, it would not last a week.

The President of the United States is interested in this matter. Sometime ago, in Senate bill 2208, we included the following provision:

SEC. 901. The President is empowered to direct the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to assign the manpower of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to the extent necessary, to protect the munitions, aircraft, and other war industries, municipal water supplies, power, and other utilities, and to protect resources subject to the hazards of forest fires.

At that time we made provision for the use of the Civilian Conservation Corps to do the very thing which the President now suggests may have to be done.

While the bill was pending before the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, the head of the Bureau

of the Budget called me on the telephone and said, "I have just received a call from the President in which I was directed to deliver to you the following language and expression of the President. My secretary took it down over the telephone from the head of the Bureau of the Budget. This is the President speaking to the committee and to the Senate through the Bureau of the Budget:

I wish you would make it clear on my behalf to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate that elimination of the Civilian Conservation Corps will call for a wholly separate appropriation to take its place in two of the Civilian Conservation Corps activities.

The first is the need for forest-fire protection, especially along the Pacific coast back as far as the Rockies where we must guard against Japanese incendiary bombs and incendiary fires during the dry season. This is essential for our national future.

The second is the building of roads and other facilities for camps. These have to be built by someone and I would have to ask for a separate appropriation or let the work out by contract instead of having it done by the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Make it clear that the abolishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps saves the Nation no money.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate to be fully advised in the matter. The provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps was voted down by the subcommittee. It was also voted down by the full committee. I am presenting this amendment because I believe that the Civilian Conservation Corps is one of the most worth-while agencies of the Government. My amendment proposes to limit the number of camps to 350. According to the testimony before the committee by representatives of the War and Navy Departments and of the War Production Board, and according to the language of the President himself, the camps would be located in Army camps throughout the country, and the enrollees would do work which would otherwise have to be done by other civilian labor. If the Civilian Conservation Corps is not continued, civilian labor in the various Army camps must be performed by other labor, which will cost much more.

The President directs the attention of the committee and of the Senate to the fact that the vast wooded belt from the Rockies to the Pacific, which contain great forest assets which belong to this country, is one of the most hazardous places we have because of the danger from invasion by those who would set incendiary fires. The dry season is approaching, and the stretch of country from the Rockies to the Pacific has its dry season. When the dry season is on, then all the more is a forest subject to fire. As I said in the beginning, there is no fire fighter in the open who is better equipped to fight a forest fire than is the C. C. C. boy, who has been trained and organized under the C. C. C. activities and program. He has proven it.

It will be said by those who will oppose the amendment that these camps are not now located in the forest areas. That may be true, and there are not enough camps provided by the amendment to protect all the forest areas, but so far

as they can protect the forest areas they will be utilized. They will be utilized for two purposes, and the President specifies those purposes. They will be utilized for work within the Army camps throughout the length and breadth of the country, and they will be utilized for purposes of fire prevention.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Senator any information as to where the camps now remaining are located?

Mr. McCARRAN. We have information as to where they will be located. I have not information at this moment as to where they are presently located, but the Senator from Tennessee is waiting to give me a shot in the ribs in just a minute or two, as to where they will be located under the curtailed program. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not do that for anything.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield, I cannot answer the question of the Senator from Delaware completely, but in the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on March 30 last, General Ulio, Adjutant General of the Army, described companies working on military reservations at the time the testimony was given, about 2 months ago. He said the companies are working in all of the nine corps areas. "Company" is the new military designation for the camp. So far as the personnel is concerned, a C. C. C. camp is composed of 200 men. He states the locations as follows:

First Corps Area, 2; Second Corps Area, 8; Third Corps Area, 11; Fourth Corps Area, 43; Fifth Corps Area, 3; Sixth Corps Area, none, but 3 were approved at that time; Seventh Corps Area, 5; Eighth Corps Area, 5; Ninth Corps Area, 10.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. Further answering the Senator from Delaware, and anticipating what my good friend the Senator from Tennessee will tell us, I shall state what the estimated distribution of 350 camps for the fiscal year 1943 will be. For a list of the number of camps, by States, I refer to page 300 of the hearings before the Senate subcommittee.

Connecticut.....	1
Maine.....	1
Massachusetts.....	1
New Hampshire.....	1
Rhode Island.....	1
Vermont.....	1

Total I..... 6

Delaware.....	0
New Jersey.....	6
New York.....	6

Total II..... 12

District of Columbia.....	1
Maryland.....	8
Pennsylvania.....	8
Virginia.....	16

Total III..... 33

Alabama.....	5
Florida.....	13
Georgia.....	31
Louisiana.....	10
Mississippi.....	8
North Carolina.....	21
South Carolina.....	11
Tennessee.....	8
Total IV.....	107
Indiana.....	6
Kentucky.....	6
Ohio.....	4
West Virginia.....	2
Total V.....	18
Illinois.....	7
Michigan.....	6
Wisconsin.....	4
Total VI.....	17
Arkansas.....	7
Iowa.....	1
Kansas.....	5
Minnesota.....	5
Missouri.....	10
Montana.....	1
Nebraska.....	1
North Dakota.....	1
South Dakota.....	4
Total VII.....	35
Arizona.....	3
Colorado.....	4
New Mexico.....	2
Oklahoma.....	7
Texas.....	20
Wyoming.....	1
Total VIII.....	37
California.....	28
Idaho.....	7
Montana.....	7
Nevada.....	1
Oregon.....	15
Utah.....	7
Washington.....	16
Wyoming.....	4
Alaska.....	0
Total IX.....	85

Mr. WALSH. On what theory are these allotments made to the various States? Is it on the basis of the number of applicants in each State, or the need of fire-fighting facilities in the various localities?

Mr. McCARRAN. I must answer largely from conclusion. Two hundred of them are placed, or will be placed, in Army camps. One hundred and fifty of them are to be placed where they will be most accessible for forest-fire prevention.

Mr. WALSH. Then the fact that a greater number of people in one community are seeking to enter these camps than in another community is not the determining factor. Is that not true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer. I wish I could. I am taking the locations of the camps as a reason for their existence.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The personnel of the camps does not necessarily come from the State. In Wyoming quite a number of our camps were manned by men from Boston and some from New York.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to dwell briefly on that suggestion. The testimony shows that boys from the East were transported to the West and put into

camps in the West, and boys from the West were transported to the East or South and put into camps there. I think that was a worthy activity, because it gave the boys a general idea of what the country was like.

Mr. President, a reduction to 350 camps and the curtailment from \$246,000,000, the appropriation for the current year, to \$48,000,000 for the coming year is certainly reducing very rapidly a facility the Government has established. That may be proper because of the demand for boys to enter the military service.

Let me say, Mr. President, that many boys of 17, 18, and 19 years of age cannot be inducted into military service. These camps will afford the very first step toward training the boys for military service. A boy of 17 is selected from a congested city and placed in a camp, where he learns, first of all, to live with his fellows. He learns to have respect for authority and to do something with his hands, whereas, as a matter of fact, during the better part of his life he had not known he could do things with his hands.

Out of these camps there have come some of the finest engineers the country has today. As a side issue, let me say that I was told by a high-ranking Army officer that these camps have furnished some of the best cooks who have gone into the Army camps. They have been trained in the Civilian Conservation Corps to understand how to handle men and how to handle and prepare food. I mention that merely to show that the contention which has been made that a Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee does nothing is absurd. He has learned in the university of life something that will stay with him and abide with him for the future.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. It provides for an appropriation of \$48,000,000 as against \$200,000,000 for the current year. It is an amendment that will permit the Civilian Conservation Corps to reduce its numbers, and yet take care of a certain group who will afterward become, by reason of their training, worth-while as soldiers, if necessary, and as civilians in time of peace.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to endorse very heartily the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada. I have peculiar reasons for appealing to Members of the Senate to agree to the amendment proposing the larger appropriation. I must admit that the reasons prevailing in the Pacific coast area are not national; but the Pacific coast is now one of the great battlegrounds of this Nation, and the impairment of our military forces there would equally affect the State of Tennessee, the State of Virginia, the State of Massachusetts, and all the other States, however remote from the Pacific coast.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the vulnerability to damage by fire of our entire mountain area, from Mexico to Canada. This year, Mr. President, already alarming and destructive fires have occurred. They have impeded our war effort, and have cost millions of dollars. Many of our trained fire fighters have been drafted into the Army.

Mr. President, unless we act more energetically and wisely than we are now acting, it is well within the bounds of probability that great fires will devastate the Pacific coast area to such an extent that the damage to the military effort could not be measured in billions of dollars. When I say that I am not exaggerating.

C. C. C. camps have been located throughout the Pacific coast area principally because of their strategic value in fighting fires. Our forestry officials have discovered that young boys of 18, 19, and 20 years of age are better adapted to fire fighting and are more effective in that work than are men of any other age group. In this particular hour, when above all other things needed in the Pacific coast area we need protection against fire, I can imagine no more costly way for Members of the Senate to economize than by abolishing the C. C. C. camps. In this hour of desperate need, the boys now in those camps could not conceivably do any work more vitally necessary for the Nation's safety than the work they are now doing.

Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I have been told by many Army officers in California that the finest material they have ever had for noncommissioned officers has come from the C. C. C. camps. The boys are hardened and prepared for military experience. They have been subjected to discipline; at 17, 18, or 19 years of age they are ready for the Army.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In the hearings upon the pending bill, Major General Ulio said exactly what the Senator from California has just said about the character of the young men who come out of the C. C. C. camps and enter the Army.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I notice that the Senator from Nevada is on his feet. Does the Senator from Nevada desire that I yield to him?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I am simply holding the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not intend to yield the floor. I desire to retain the floor; but, of course, I am glad to have the Senator from California proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has been recognized and has the floor at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada in a few moments.

Mr. President, I think I voice the common sentiment of the people of the West when I say that one of the most valuable investments this Nation has ever had is its C. C. C. camps and their personnel, and that the most unfortunate day to do away with those camps would be this day, when our vulnerability to and danger from fire, both by incendiary bombs and by sabotage, are so extreme that even on the floor of the Senate I shall not paint the picture—a picture which may well come into being, a picture of almost

our entire area being destroyed by fire. That is a possibility, Mr. President. Every fire expert knows it, and every fire expert realizes that one of the best and cheapest safeguards against that danger is the camps which some Members of the Senate now seek to destroy entirely.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from Tennessee desires to be heard; if so, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator make whatever statement he wishes to make regarding the matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have made my preliminary statement; but I do not wish to yield the floor, because I am in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a few questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say that I am open-minded on the subject. I am generally inclined to go along with committee recommendations; but I have followed the argument made by the Senator from Nevada, and it is impressive to me.

One thing which disturbs me is this: Under existing circumstances, where are we to get the men to man these camps? Will men be available to put into the Civilian Conservation Corps camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. I can answer the Senator only by repeating in substance the statements made before the subcommittee by Mr. McEntee, who is in charge of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and by others, that it will be entirely possible to obtain enrollees to man 350 camps, and perhaps more.

Many of the enrollees come from congested centers. There is in the RECORD a statement to which attention will be drawn. The statement is that in the past 35 percent of the enrollees have come from rural areas. That statement will be dwelt upon at length, with the thought in mind of showing Members of the Senate that the enrollees should not be taken from rural areas because rural labor is essential to farm life. However, the boys who enroll from rural areas are not necessarily from the farms. They are from rural areas; it may be from farming areas or it may be from areas beyond the limits of cities. However, they are boys who will not go onto the farms. They have other lines of activity in their minds. That has been true all through the history of the Civilian Conservation Corps. A boy who would go into a factory or into a craft would not now go into the Civilian Conservation Corps. A great many boys and young men are attracted to that life because they see a chance for activity, a chance to earn something, and a chance to get into the open. I take it that the enrollees would be enlisted to a great extent from the larger groups in congested centers.

Mr. BROWN. I presume there would be a considerable number of enrollees from those who are rejected for Army service by reason of physical or other defects.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. How many is it anticipated will be required to man the 350 camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. There are 200 men to a company, and a camp is a company.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, about 70,000 altogether. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; about sixty-five or seventy thousand altogether.

Mr. BROWN. One thing that concerns me in the picture is this: At one time, when I was representing the eleventh congressional district in the House of Representatives, I think the statement was made—and it was no particular credit to me—that that district had in it more camps than there were in any other district in the country. There were a very large number of such camps throughout the forest regions of northern Michigan.

There must be a tremendous investment of Federal money in them. What provision is made at the present time for the maintenance of those camps? I know the lumber woods pretty well. If they are simply allowed to remain unserved, they will be gone; they will not be any good; and, unquestionably, there will be, as the Senator very well points out, a great demand for these camps, after the war is over, to take care of our excess manpower. Is there any provision being made for the maintenance of the large number of camps which necessarily are vacant and will be vacant for some time?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provision of the bill is—and it was put in by the House—that these camps and the equipment and the housekeeping utensils and the like shall be turned over to the Army, if the Army wants them. Those which are not to be taken care of by the Army, and are not utilized by the Army, may be turned over to municipalities, counties, cities, and other organizations of that kind.

Mr. BROWN. Does not the Senator fear, unless there is some manpower in the C. C. C. itself to service the camps, that a great many of them will simply fall into ruin?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the statement made to me by Mr. McEntee, who is in charge of the Civilian Conservation Corps; indeed, the statement need scarcely be made to anyone, because it is self-evident that an unoccupied building in the wilds or in the woods will very shortly deteriorate, and it will be only a short time when there will be no building there, as a matter of fact. So it was drawn to my attention, and I draw it to the attention of the Senate, that for the purpose of taking care of this situation alone, a considerable sum of money will be required. I think I read it to the Senate a moment ago, but I take leave to read it again. I think it comes under this head:

Transportation and storage of supplies pending transfer to the War Department or some other agency of the Government, and expenses incidental thereto, \$2,600,000.

Mr. BROWN. Is that in the bill or is it in the Senator's proposed amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what it will cost if the bill goes through as it comes from the House.

Mr. BROWN. I call the Senator's attention to one other fact. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and asked that \$1,000,000 be added to the agricultural appropriation bill for the purpose of saving the roads which the Civilian Conservation Corps has built in northern Michigan. I am most familiar with the situation there. The committee accepted the proposal, and the Senate adopted it. I understand that it, in conference, has been largely cut.

In my own State six camps would still remain, according to the statement made by the Senator. If his amendment is adopted, is it probable that the enrollees of the six C. C. C. camps in Michigan could be used and would be used for the purpose of maintaining the roads in forest areas which, if not maintained, I assure the Senator, will be almost a total loss; in other words, all the money we have put into these roads would have been uselessly spent, and they are a very material factor in preventing forest fires and in opening forest areas for citizens of Michigan. If the Senator's amendment would, throughout the country generally, provide some small amount of manpower which could be used for the maintenance of these roads, I should be very much inclined to support the proposal, because we will lose many million dollars spent upon these highways unless something of that kind shall be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could best answer the Senator from Michigan perhaps in the language of the President, most of which I read to the Senate a moment ago. It is found on page 478 of the hearings.

The second reason for maintaining the Civilian Conservation Corps "is the building of roads and other facilities for camps. These have to be built by someone."

That does not answer the Senator's question exactly, but my judgment would be that there would be six camps in Michigan. I can only conjecture that the natural thing would be to utilize the enrollees of one or more of those six camps to keep in repair the roads already constructed.

Mr. BROWN. I know that has been the practice in the past; for instance, if a camp was located, we will say, in one county and some 75 miles away another camp was located, when the first camp was abandoned the enrollees of the other camp maintained the forest roads which had been constructed by the first camp. I am very fearful that unless that shall be done we will lose the tremendous investment we have made in the forest trails.

Mr. McCARRAN. The expression of the able Senator from Michigan is worthy of being dwelt on at length, because, if we terminate entirely the Civilian Conservation Corps, as would be done by the bill that is now before the Senate, we will have lost everything in the way of investment that we have put into the

Civilian Conservation Corps. It would be really a travesty, a sad thing.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in regard to the maintenance of roads and parks, I will say to the Senator from Michigan that in the Shenandoah National Park all the camps have been taken out. It is not my understanding that it is proposed to make any substantial improvement in the roads under this limited program.

On May 25 Director McEntee made this statement before the committee:

The estimate presented here is for 350 C. C. C. barrack camps. It is proposed that approximately 200 of these will be assigned to work on military reservations and strategic areas and 150 will be assigned to essential natural resource protective projects. In addition to these barrack camps in the continental United States, this estimate provides for the operation of projects on certain Indian reservations and projects in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

So 200 of them, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, will be assigned to work on military reservations and 150 will be assigned to essential natural-resource protective projects. Six camps for an entire State, I may say, could do very little, in my judgment, for the maintenance of roads.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to interrupt him further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that if my own proposal to the Appropriations Committee providing for \$1,000,000 for the maintenance of these roads had been adopted, it was adopted by the Senate, but I understand that it has been heavily cut now, although it is still in conference between the House and the Senate—

Mr. BYRD. What department would have the spending of the \$1,000,000?

Mr. BROWN. The Department of Agriculture. The amendment is in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which is in charge of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If that appropriation had been retained in the bill—I understand it was not retained—I would be inclined to vote against the proposal of the Senator from Nevada, but I know that six Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the forest area of Michigan, intelligently directed, could save hundreds of miles of forest trails which otherwise would be lost, and their saving would be accomplished by the expenditure of very little money. A little log bridge with a stream running under it washes out and nothing is done; there is nobody to maintain it. Yet it could be repaired by the expenditure of \$10 with one truck and two or three men. Once the bridge is gone, however, the whole road is out.

It was with great regret that I learned that my proposal was rejected by the House conferees. I do not blame the Senate conferees in the slightest, because I know they battled for it; but I want to save these roads; they are worth much more than the \$48,000,000 the Senator from Nevada is talking about. If it will

save those roads, I shall favor his proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator from Michigan any idea where the six camps in Michigan are located?

Mr. BROWN. In the northern area.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know, but does the Senator know whether they are near the roads which are to be built?

Mr. BROWN. The roads to be maintained. I am talking about the maintenance of roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am just reminded by the record that a gentleman testified before the committee, on the invitation of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and stated there were wonderful forests in California. They brought a map, with great red areas marked upon it, and said, "Here are the forests of California which these boys have saved." I have the record and will read it in a few moments. None of the camps were in a forest area. What good will the camps do to the forests of California unless the camps are placed in the forests or near the forests?

So far as the roads are concerned, I am quite sure that if the Senator from Michigan intends to vote for the proposal here offered on the theory that he is to get roads built in Michigan, he is going to be the most disappointed Senator I have ever known.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Tennessee misapprehended what I said. I am not asking that a single mile of new road be built. I am asking that the roads upon which we have spent millions of dollars, forest trails, be maintained. That was my purpose in appearing before the agricultural subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I did not ask for the construction of any new roads. I want the roads which are already built to be saved for the people of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could answer the Senator from Tennessee by saying that as in other sections of the country, where roads or series of roads or trails have been constructed by one Civilian Conservation Camp, and that civilian camp has been abandoned or moved away, another, even remote from that spot, would come and keep the roads in repair. That has been the custom and practice.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee that a great area of California was shown on the map in red as being a forest area, and that there were no camps in the vicinity, the real truth of the matter is that there were no camps in the red area, and there was no forest in the red area either. I know every foot of that country. There is nothing but manzanita brush all over the red area. It is just north of Los Angeles, and between Los Angeles and the Tehachapi range. There is not a tree on it; nothing but snow brush. That may be called forest in some places.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not yield at wish to say at the very outset of my re-

marks that no man more actively and earnestly supported the C. C. C. camps, when they were first instituted in 1933, than did I. As every Senator knows, the purpose in establishing the C. C. C. was to take care of the young boys of the country who had no work, who had nothing to do, who were compelled to loaf, who were without funds to support themselves. To my mind, the Government very wisely established camps to take care of those boys.

The prime purpose of the camps was to give the boys a semblance of employment, at any rate, to keep them out of mischief, to help them maintain themselves in every way possible. Under the financial condition which then confronted this country, it was absolutely necessary that that should be done.

Today the picture has entirely changed. I cannot give a better illustration of it than to quote the testimony of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is now, I believe, a colonel in the Army. About 6 months ago, I think it was, Mr. McEntee was before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, when he was the head of the C. C. C., as he still is. The Senator from Massachusetts asked Mr. McEntee why it was that trucks with advertisements on their sides were going around the streets of Boston, as he had seen them, drumming up members for the C. C. C., advertising for boys to come in and accept the benefits of the C. C. C.

Mr. President, this illustrates what a change has come about in this country. Someone—as I recall, it was the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]—asked a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada a while ago as to where we would be able to get them if we provided for 70,000 boys. That is a very pertinent question. Where would we get the 70,000 boys? We will either take them from among the very young boys, who should be in school, or take them out of the Army; or perhaps we would take them out of industry. The boys simply cannot be gotten.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator a little later. I have outlined the statement I wish to make, and at its conclusion I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, in its time the C. C. C. was a proper activity. I voted for every appropriation ever made for it, from the beginning until this year. I have never failed to vote for appropriations to maintain it, because I thought it was needed. But now, when it is no longer needed for the boys, when it is no longer needed for the Army, when we are in a war which staggers the imagination in its ramifications throughout the world, why should we continue a wholly unnecessary, a wholly extravagant, a wholly wasteful activity such as this?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to excuse me for just a few minutes.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask a question on the point the Senator is discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oklahoma is smiling. He may make a speech on this subject later.

Mr. President, what are the questions before us? Two have been suggested, that we should keep these camps, because 200 of them are going to be at military camps, and that it is proper to keep them there so the C. C. C. boys can wait on the Army and do the chores around Army camps which ordinarily civil labor must be employed to do. I challenge Mr. McEntee to furnish figures to show that such work can be done more cheaply by the C. C. C. boys, as he said it could. He never brought us any such figures.

Mr. President, if ever there was a frightful and wasteful and extravagant proposal it is that which is made with respect to these C. C. C. camps at military camps.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] a few moments ago said, as I understood him, that under his amendment only \$48,000,000 was to be appropriated for this purpose.

I read from the amendment:

For pay, subsistence, medical services—

And so forth. For the boys—
\$48,499,288.

Right underneath that I read again:

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental—

Notice that the word "departmental" is used—

In connection with the administration of camps and works projects, \$28,030,512.

The proposed appropriation is not \$48,000,000; it is \$76,000,000 plus.

Mr. President, Senators should have heard Mr. McEntee's testimony. He testified that when he turns these camps over he makes an allotment to the Army for each camp. The Army is then responsible for paying out the money, for managing the boys, for the administrative features, of course, and we have two organizations doing the same thing. We have the War Department administering the act as well as the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps. I believe Mr. McEntee said that the War Department administered it only in the daytime and that at night his organization administered it.

Those boys must do a great deal of night work to require an appropriation of \$28,030,512 for the field and departmental work. If his organization had proposed to turn these 200 camps over to the Army and turned that part of the proposed appropriation, \$28,000,000, over to the Army and let the Army administer it, that would be a different thing; but when his organization asks for \$28,000,000 for the administration of a fund of \$48,000,000, which is proposed to be appropriated for the enrollees, that means that about two-fifths of the total amount goes to administration and only three-fifths goes to the purposes proposed to be administered. Two-fifths is a large percentage to be used for administration. Ordinarily 5 percent is regarded as a large amount for administration. In

this case, however, it is 40 percent for administration. Forty-eight million dollars is proposed to be appropriated for the boys, and \$28,000,000 for those who are looking after the boys, and they are turning the administrative feature of the work over to the Army in 200 camps.

Mr. President, that is not all. The Civilian Conservation Corps organization does not in many cases do any practical managing of the boys, because 150 of the camps are turned over to the Department of Agriculture and to the Department of the Interior, and the management and control and administration of the boys in those camps is really in the hands of those two Departments.

So, Mr. President, when it comes to the question of cost, the proposed appropriation would be a frightful waste of the people's money at a time when the Government needs money as it never before in its history has needed it.

Are Senators going to put the C. C. C. officers ahead of the Army of the United States? That is really what is proposed to be done. If the amendment shall be adopted, we shall appropriate money which ought to be used at this time for the Army. We must win the war. We ought not to dissipate our resources in any such way as is here proposed.

Mr. President, I next come to a discussion of the matter of fire control. A map of California, which was produced before the committee, was very significant. It was brought before the committee by Mr. Loveridge, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

I read from his statement:

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, in line with your request that I conserve time as much as possible, I have prepared a brief statement.

I shall not read it all. He continues:

In 1940 some 3,500,000 man-days—

Mr. President, each one of those boys had better be working a full day instead of a man-day. Whenever I hear a witness talking about man-days I do not have much confidence in his testimony.

In 1940 some 3,500,000 man-days of their time was devoted directly to fire-control duties, and 6,500,000 man-days additional on other work necessary to fire protection. * * *

That is the background. We now have facing us the toughest fire-control problem we have ever had because, as you know, important new war industries have been located in forest areas. * * *

Located in forest areas. Where are those forest areas? A secret map of California was brought to us. I presume the map is a military secret. I shall not disclose it. I shall not refer to the map. I shall not divulge military secrets. I shall not violate confidences reposed in us. A large map of California was brought before the committee, and the witness pointed out to the committee the forests, which were marked in red on the map. This is the testimony in respect thereto, and I hardly know how to express myself concerning it—well, I shall simply read the testimony without expressing myself about it:

Mr. LOVERIDGE. The record there shows 28 in California.

Senator McKELLAR. In the whole State?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Twenty-eight in California, and I want to know how many in the red area.

I was speaking of the red area shown on the map in California. Mr. President, I am afraid the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is not listening to what I am saying, but I want him to hear it because I like the Senator. There are 28 camps in the forests included in the red areas.

Mr. LOVERIDGE. What is the number in southern California, Mr. Morrell?

Senator McKELLAR. No; not in southern California but in that wooded area—forested area.

I am reading the actual testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. No; not in southern California, but in that wooded area—forested area.

Referring to the area marked on the confidential map:

Senator McCARRAN. The Senator is now referring to the proposed allocation of camps in the program, if this program is carried out.

Senator McKELLAR. Maybe Mr. McEntee can tell us how many there are.

Mr. McEntee. Not anywhere near enough. I know that, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, I would like to know how many there are. Maybe you could help us out on that. All we want to know is how many of them there are.

Meaning in the red or wooded area.

Mr. McEntee's answer was:

There are 28 camps in California.

He is supposed to be the head of the C. C. C. He had farmed out all of this part to the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department; and, of course, he did not know where they were. His answer was:

There are 28 camps in California.

I ought to have been perfectly willing to accept that answer, but I was not.

Senator McKELLAR. I understand that; but I want to know how many there are in this wooded district that he says is exceedingly important.

Mr. McEntee. May I put it this way, Senator?

He was giving me the "run around." I have had that done before, by witnesses and others.

Mr. McEntee. May I put it this way, Senator? We had a fire in the Lake Superior area 4 years ago, and we moved camps from as far away as Ohio in there.

Up to that time, he had not said that there were none in the wooded area. I am reminded of something which happened when I was a boy. I was clerking in a country store. My employer had one of the worst little sons I ever saw in my life. His name was Hurst Whittington. I was in the back room working on the books. Mr. Whittington came back to see me about something, and we were talking over my desk. In a few moments Mr. Whittington went out into the main part of the store. Presently he uttered a cry of horror. He found that someone had left the molasses faucet open and that about 50 gallons of molasses had run out while he was in the back room. He went to the front door and called to his young son, "Whoo, Hurst!" The little fellow came running out from under the

store, crying, "Papa, I didn't do it. Papa, I didn't do it." [Laughter.]

So here is McEntee—

Mr. McCARRAN. In the molasses.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the molasses; yes. [Laughter.]

I continue with the testimony.

Senator McKELLAR. I understand that, but I want to know how many there are in this wooded district that he says is exceedingly important.

He brought a great map to show how many there were, and how necessary it was to protect this wooded district in California. His answer was:

Mr. McEntee. May I put it this way, Senator? We had a fire in the Lake Superior area 4 years ago, and we moved camps from as far away as Ohio in there. The distance over the State wouldn't make any difference, as long as there are roads to get men in there.

If the Senator's house were on fire and he had to send out to Wyoming for a fire engine, it would not arrive before the house had burned down. So, in the case of a forest fire, much of the forest would be burned before a group of boys could be brought from Idaho or Michigan.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator refers to Wyoming and to my house.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I should be perfectly satisfied to have the fire department in the lower part of town. I should not want it in my front yard. Anyone who has been in the forest areas in the West, where forest fires occur, knows that it is a very common thing to bring in men from a distance of 200 miles. We rush them in pretty fast. We do not keep them there all year sitting around watching to see if there is going to be a fire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator ever have a C. C. C. camp brought in to look after a fire?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; but I saw the C. C. C. camps moved in to look after forest fires around Cody. Five of the boys are now buried there. They were burned to death in the woods. Use is made of them to put out big fires. Sometimes they are brought in from a distance of 200 miles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me continue with the testimony. I was a little persistent:

Senator McKELLAR. I will put it another way. Are there any camps in that area that the witness has designated as tremendously important timbered region? Are there any camps in there?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Where is that camp?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There are at least three that Mr. Morrell's record indicates.

Senator McKELLAR. Where are they on the map?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There is one in about this locality [indicating]. I can give you the approximate locality.

Senator McKELLAR. That is north of Los Angeles?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. In the same county?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. I suppose so. Los Angeles covers all that country.

Senator McKELLAR. That is what I understand. Where is the next one?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There is one not far from San Bernardino. San Bernardino also, you will recall, is not far from Los Angeles.

By the way, that is not in the red district.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, where is the next one?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. San Bernardino is 60 miles east of Los Angeles, and there is one at Kline, Calif., out from San Diego. That again—this is San Diego [indicating], and this will be up in this timbered country here.

Senator McCARRAN. Timbered country?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McCARRAN. Now, are there any camps at all in that red area there?

Does that red indicate timber country?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. That is covered with chaparral and other brush.

Senator McCARRAN. That is not timber country.

Senator McKELLAR. He said it was timber.

Senator McCARRAN. I know he did testify that it was timber country, but what he means by that, Senator, is that it is covered with a heavy growth of what we call underbrush or low brush, generally known as chaparral.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Downey] that if he is expecting to have the C. C. C. camps save California from fires, may God have mercy on him, because, in my judgment, the C. C. C. camps would not save the country from fires.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, and not for a speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as I have referred to the Senator, I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the testimony shows how many of the California camps would be at military posts and how many outside?

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony does not show.

With reference to fire control, in the Appropriations Committee not long ago my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Holman] offered an amendment to increase the appropriation for fire control in the Department of Agriculture from \$5,000,000 to \$17,000,000. It gave me the greatest pleasure to vote for it and support it on the floor. Why? Because the fire fighters provided for by that appropriation are trained, and the work is done in an economical and proper way. Let me say to Senators from the West, in whose States forests are located, that I shall always maintain that attitude in dealing with protection against forest fires. However, when I am asked to appropriate \$48,000,000 for boys—and I understand that the age would be reduced to 16—to fight forest fires, to turn the activity over to the War Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior, and pay the administrators in Washington \$28,000,000 for administration, I cannot do so conscientiously. I feel that I owe my country the duty of saving money for the more important business of saving our Nation.

Mr. President, I shall now leave the subject of forests except as to the prevention of forest fires. The principal argument here revolves around the prevention of forest fires. Do Senators know where the greatest forests in America are located?

Mr. BONE. In the States of Washington and Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The greatest forests belonging to the United States are located in the Territory of Alaska. They contain more wood than do the forests in any other region. They contain the finest kinds of wood. If it is the desire of the proponents of the amendment under discussion to save forests, would they not make provision to locate at least one camp in Alaska to prevent fires in some of the forests there?

Referring to the record, I find that the allotment for Alaska is represented by a zero. There are no camps for the prevention of forest fires in Alaska. The people there will have to do the best they can to save those forests.

Mr. President, I invite attention now to the cost of the proposal. In my judgment, the cost of doing the necessary work by private labor would be almost a bagatelle compared with the cost of maintaining this organization. We know what the cost will be. It will be at least 5 times greater than would be the cost if civilian workers did the work.

I know Mr. McEntee has a somewhat fantastic proposition to offer which he thinks will save the Government something like \$62,000,000. I have no doubt he is a well-meaning man, but he does not know about costs. Let us consider this for a moment. There is one area that has only one camp, as I recall, namely, the Chicago area. Under the new arrangement there will be only one camp located there.

I asked Adjutant General Ulio how much it would cost to keep the camps in condition by employing civilian labor. He said he would get the information and have it put into the record. We have never received it. It cannot be obtained; but there can be no doubt that it would be very much less than the figure I have indicated.

The amendment would provide for 200 camps, which are absolutely unnecessary. Civilian labor can do the work very much better. It would put these camps, which would be set up by the Government, in competition with civilian labor. Why should it be done? Why should we adopt a measure which would result in setting up a governmental instrumentality to compete with civilian labor? It is not the proper thing to do, and we should not do it. When our boys had nothing to eat, very little to wear, and nothing to do, it was necessary for the Government to resort to the measures which were then adopted, but it is unnecessary to do that now. Our country was never so prosperous as it is today. It is proposed not only to maintain many boys, but, in addition, we are asked to maintain administrators to the extent of \$28,000,000, and of that I do not approve.

Mr. President, I come to the next item. I have already spoken of the two items of overhead under this amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have order? I want the able Senator from Tennessee to be heard. It will be quite necessary for him to be heard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator just quoted \$28,000,000 as the amount for the administrative expenses of the C. C. C. camps. Can he tell us what proportion that \$28,000,000 bears to the wages paid to those in the

C. C. C. camps who do the actual work, and also to the total expenses of the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall furnish the figures to the Senator in a few moments. I do not have them in mind, but I will say that I believe the salaries of the administrators in proportion to those of the men in the C. C. C. camps are approximately 5 or 6 to 1. If the Senator from Maine has the figures I will yield to him.

Mr. WHITE. I am not sure I have the information, but I have a figure of \$1,054 per man per year. There are roughly 70,000 men, making an aggregate of about \$70,000,000. I therefore conclude that the payments to the men would amount to about \$70,000,000 as against administrative expenses of about \$28,000,000. I am not sure of those figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the expenses and salaries of the C. C. C. amount to about \$28,000,000, and the boys in the camps get \$48,000,000. But that is liberal. That is not as costly as the N. Y. A., the administration of which requires an even larger part of the appropriation. No more extravagant set-ups were ever established by the Government.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I desire to talk about the boys. Where are we to get them? Where are the boys coming from? It has been said that they will come from the cities. I do not believe there will be many boys from the cities. In my section of the country 40 percent of the C. C. C. boys come off the farms. I am sorry the able Senator from South Carolina left the Chamber, because I should like to cite his experience in making further proof of my contentions. The Senator from South Carolina has a farm of 500 acres. He is cultivating only 30 acres, because he cannot get any labor on his farm. His manager is plowing and hoeing 30 acres of cotton. Where will we get the taxes with which to run this war if we are to take the boys out of industry and take them off the farms? Where are we going? It is a serious matter, Senators. It is not merely a question of \$76,000,000 for this extravagant organization; that is not the sole question. Where are we going when we spend money in this way? We should not do it. Under the conditions confronting us every dollar possible should be expended in the prosecution of the war. I am a thousand percent for an all-out effort to win the war, and I know every other Senator shares my views.

Under such circumstances why should we throw away the money on extravagance here in Washington? Why should we duplicate the overhead? I leave the question with the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], on page 18, beginning in line 10, to strike out certain words and to substitute therefor certain language relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barbour	Hill	Rosier
Bilbo	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brown	Lee	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment or two of the time of the Senate to speak in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of the arguments which have been made. I take the stand, as one who has sponsored and supported the C. C. C. since its inception, the stand just taken by the Senator from Tennessee, that the C. C. C. organization was quite essential and necessary. I go a step further than the Senator from Tennessee, and say that the C. C. C., as an organization, has justified itself from the social standpoint, from the economic standpoint, from the military standpoint and from the educational standpoint. Considering those four factors the C. C. C. has a splendid record.

Many of the things the C. C. C. organization has done are things which still have to be done. In normal times many of the things which it has done it cannot do now, because these are not normal times, and, as has been pointed out, the efforts of all the country should be turned in one direction. Yet we must remember that the population of our country is not static, it is fluid, and if we are to use all the elements of our country in the most economic way, which is the basic theory of the Selective Service Act, we must never lose sight of the fact that there are a million young boys around the age of 17 or becoming 17 each year.

It is all very well to say that all the boys in the C. C. C. camps should be doing something else. Perhaps they should. Any one of us here who will review his life will probably say that there was many a time in his life when he should have been doing something else than what he was doing. We have not all had a record of 100-percent perfection and efficiency in our lives, and the hundred or the thousand or the million C. C. C. boys, and the million boys of C. C. age, have not a record of 100 percent of perfection and efficiency in their lives.

They cannot do the things that it is suggested they should do. It is said they should be in the Navy. The Navy will take boys of 17 years of age, but all the boys of this country cannot reach a naval

recruiting office. It is said they should be in the Army. If a boy of 17 years of age should enlist in the Army he would commit fraud and would be subject to discharge; likewise a boy of 16 years of age who tried to enlist in the Army would commit a fraud. A boy of 18 years of age can, with his parents' consent, enter the Army; but they have not all gone into the Army and many of them will not go. Yet there is tremendous economic worth in this group of young boys, and that worth should be used at a time such as this when the value of every man's effort is worth while. It is said C. C. C. boys should go into the munitions industry, and, of course, they should; but how can they? Is it not realized by Senators that there is at this very time an unemployment problem even in the city of New York? Is it not realized that there has been a dislocation of our whole economic life, as a result of our war effort, and that the city of New York, which, in the last war, was practically the only port from which munitions and war supplies were sent out is today in many respects a sort of ghost city, because there are 78,000 empty apartment houses in New York City? That is not the case in Washington.

The proposal with regard to the continuance of the C. C. C. has been placed before us in a message sent in directly by the President of the United States. The Budget Bureau made certain recommendations for the C. C. C., which recommendations were ignored by the House of Representatives. The President has told us that if we do not appropriate the money recommended for the C. C. C. establishment, we will have to appropriate more money for accomplishing the same economic purposes which are being accomplished by the C. C. C.

I wish to argue the points which I am going to try to make from the social standpoint, from the economic standpoint, from the educational standpoint, and from the military standpoint, because all these factors are to be considered when we pass judgment upon the pending amendment.

These boys should go into munitions plants, it is said. Let them get into the munitions plants, if they can. Every Senator who has had experience with the employment of labor, even at a time when there is a great demand for labor in various industrial plants of the country, must realize that the standard for employment is higher than it has ever been in the history of the country. Personnel directors are making greater demands upon the persons they employ. Let a 17-year-old untrained boy try to get into one of the munitions plants. A plant would be criminally negligent if it employed persons without training.

Where are these boys to get their training? How are they to get their training? The schools have not been able to give it to them, and there are many reasons why that is so. There are very many boys who do not go to the schools, I am sad to have to say.

There are some things which have to be done and which are actually being done. In December 1941, immediately after Pearl Harbor, the Secretary of War, because we needed it, because the

military necessities of our country demanded it, requested that certain C. C. C. facilities be handed over to the Army. What have these boys and what have these organizations been doing for the Army? They have constructed narrow-gauge railways, they have constructed and repaired roads and bridges, they have constructed firebreaks and lookout towers. Firebreaks and lookout towers are as essential around military camps as they are in the midst of forests. They are more essential around the great munition-building areas, which are being established, even upon the desert. I am thankful the Army of the United States is taking care to protect us from the ordinary hazards.

C. C. C. boys are working on truck trails for fire suppression; the construction of training aids, such as bayonet courses, rifle ranges, antitank ranges, and pistol ranges. All these facilities are essential in the fundamental training of soldiers. They are constructing telephone lines and power lines. These boys are doing what trained labor would have to do if the work were left to ordinary trained labor.

The argument has been made that they are depriving trained labor of a livelihood. This is no time to make an argument of that kind. Trained labor is well taken care of. Trained labor is getting jobs, except in isolated places where there have been changes as the result of the trends of our business outlook.

C. C. C. boys are fencing military reservations, an extremely essential and necessary activity. They are clearing wooded areas for fire prevention. They are clearing maneuver and impact areas. They are clearing bombing fields. They are clearing, grading, and seeding or sodding landing fields for aircraft. They are taking care of drainage in these areas. They are carrying on mosquito-control work on the military reservations.

Mosquito control includes measures of control other than drainage. They are spraying mosquito-breeding areas. They are still carrying on soil-conservation work, because on our military reservations, even when they are working on them, there is necessity for taking care of soil conservation where grading is to be done, where soil has been shifted. A rainstorm will come and destroy much of the ground, and it must have care.

I cannot help adverting for a moment to one point about the C. C. C., which everyone seems to have forgotten, in reference to a condition which has been with us from the beginning of our country. Those who like to read about the forethought of the founders of this Republic will be happy to know—I am sure all Senators, especially the Senators from Virginia, know this—that the problem of soil erosion was with the fathers just as it is with us today, and Patrick Henry pointed out that the man who prevents the formation of a gully is the greatest of patriots. So the C. C. C., in its ordinary conservation work, is performing a task which, under Patrick Henry's definition, makes the members patriots.

Mr. President, that is not all. If a boy has an aptitude for training, and studies in the evening, he is able to work on top-

ographic mapping and survey work, an essential in all military activity. The removal of and salvage of material from abandoned buildings on military reservations is one of the activities of the C. C. C. They are also engaged in the construction of safety paths and roads at arsenals, and erosion control on storage igloos at ordnance plants. Oh, how essential that is in the great storehouses where powder and ammunition are kept, when we realize how much damage can be done by slight neglect.

They are engaged in the operation of sawmills. Thus we might go on. This catalog of things which are being done is not a catalog which I worked out myself, it was worked out by The Adjutant General of the Army of the United States, wherein he pointed out the need for a continuation of the work being performed. It is 100-percent military, and it is contributing to the military effort.

Mr. President, in times like the present, in arguing for something we generally are satisfied when we prove that something is essential to the military effort. I have been on the Committee on Military Affairs since the beginning of my term in the Senate, and I know something of the feelings of Members of Congress when it comes to military necessity. The President of the United States has said that the continuation of the C. C. C. is a military necessity. The Secretary of War has testified that their work is necessary. The Adjutant General of the Army has not only testified as to what they are doing, but has pointed out that if the C. C. C. boys do not continue to do this work, then the Department will have to turn to that field which has so few men to contribute, the regular labor rolls.

Mr. President, we do not have to take the testimony of the Army as to the value of the C. C. C. We all know that if we had been preparing for the great emergency which faces us today, we could not have done a finer thing than to have started the C. C. C. organization. It has provided the Army of the United States with that single thing which was so much lacking in Hitler's army when Hitler expanded his army under compulsory military training from the treaty army of 100,000 men up to 4,000,000 men.

Hitler was able to do that because of the training the 100,000 men had, but Hitler was lacking in one thing, he was lacking in something which we have. After he had expanded his army he did not have the non-coms necessary for the expanded army, because, except in his boys' training camps, there had not been such training as has been afforded by the C. C. C. camps. The United States Army has been able to turn to the C. C. C. for men who have had the socializing influences of camp life—not of military training in the ordinary sense—for men who could become leaders of squads and leaders of larger units. The Army has been able to turn to the C. C. C. for cooks, for truck drivers, for helpers, for persons of that kind. The training which the C. C. C. boys have had has made the expansion of our Army very much easier.

Mr. President, I said when I began my remarks that the existence of the C. C. C. could be justified with respect to all pur-

poses for which it was set up. It can be justified economically right now in the war effort. Seventy thousand boys can be had from a pool of boys who will not find employment in any other way, who will be made better by their employment in the C. C. C., and who will be prepared for military activity when the draft law calls them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have before me a letter from the American Legion, Department of Illinois, in which the adjutant advises me that if the C. C. C. is eliminated some 15,000 World War veterans will be affected. I wonder if the Senator could give me any information as to how these World War veterans fit into this picture.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall let the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] do so, because he has already given that information, I believe.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator from Nevada already made such an explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have made an explanation, but I shall make it briefly again.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator be so kind as to do so?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. It came about in the initial stages of the C. C. C. in this wise. About 1933 or 1934, after the C. C. C. had been set up, what is known as the bonus march on Washington occurred. A number of ex-service men marched on Washington in the bonus drive. Those boys were taken care of for a few weeks in C. C. C. camps near Washington, and that gave impetus to a movement out of which has grown a population of some 15,000 ex-service men in camps out over the country. Those ex-service men are living the camp life; they are doing C. C. C. work; they are being taken care of under the C. C. C. program. Those 15,000 are not only ex-service men, but quite a number are what are called territorials, such as Indians, and men from our Territories.

Mr. LUCAS. Are these men segregated in separate camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are in their own camps.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it necessary to be a veteran of the last war before one can get into such a camp?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. What type of work have those veterans been doing in the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. Approximately the same type of work as that done by the other enrollees.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may ask a further question, is there any evidence in the record of what may or may not happen to these men who have done this work, in the event the C. C. C. is eliminated?

Mr. McCARRAN. They will be returned to their places of residence at the expense of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I may add a word further in respect to the veterans in the C. C. C. organization. Many of the veterans who have served in the past 9 or 10 years have, through their C. C. C. activity, obtained the type of

skill which has permitted them to become leaders of groups in the C. C. C. These men have been able to better themselves. It has not been a static group by any means. It has been not simply a group of 15,000 individuals, but it has been a changing group of about 15,000 from time to time. Now, after 10 years, to turn loose the 15,000 men of the veterans' group, including the least skilled among them, many of whom are less adaptable to get the kind of training that would fit them for other places, would result in great hardship. In the history of the United States probably no more harsh thing has ever been suggested to a group of veterans than the policy suggested with respect to the C. C. C. at the present time. Of course the President would have to find other provisions for these men. We owe it to them. No one goes into a C. C. C. camp who can obtain work elsewhere. We all know that. We ought to think about it, and think about it hard before destroying an institution which has done much good.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] a moment ago made the suggestion in a private conversation with the Senator from Illinois that we are in some way obligated to take care of these 15,000 veterans. I do not quite understand how that can be.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. It seems to me we have a moral if not a legal obligation to these veterans, because when we signed them up, when they enlisted, they enlisted with the understanding that they would be given a certain limited period of service. They have that period of service coming to them. I do not believe we can abruptly terminate it merely by cutting off this appropriation. It occurs to me that we not only will be called upon to pay their transportation home, but we will be called upon to liquidate the obligation we owe to them for the remainder of the term of enlistment.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, it would be fairly costly to the Government if we should have to liquidate 15,000 World War veterans overnight. I do not have any notion of what the cost might be. It could not be done for a song.

Mr. MEAD. Under the terms of the hastily proposed elimination of the C. C. C. it would cost all the way from \$15,000,000 to \$30,000,000 to liquidate the organization. This matter was never given the consideration it merits, and if it had been given the consideration it merits it would have been brought in here under entirely different auspices.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one more item to which I wish to refer, and in doing so I may become quite serious, because to me it is one of the most serious things which faces our country. Everyone knows, in spite of what has been said about the forests of the Pacific coast in the argument previously made, that the forests in the West are what are termed dry forests.

For several months in every year those forests exist without any rain. There are no great rivers running through them. There are no great marshes in them, and there are no great sloughs in them. They are indeed tinder boxes. The State of California, south of San Francisco, can burn from one end to the other without meeting obstruction from a single fire break which Nature has put there. The desert lands are just as easy to set fire to. Portions of Oregon and Washington also are dry. The Rocky Mountain forests are dry.

Mr. President, Japan is a forest land. Of course, someone thoughtlessly might say that if they burn our forests we will burn their forests. I am going to say something that cannot be measured statistically, but I know Japan from the top to the bottom of its islands. Japan cannot be burned. In the first place, there is a forest service there which is over 700 years old. Japan is thickly populated. There is heavy moisture and there are many rivers in Japan's forests. If we are to make comparisons between Japan's ability to burn our western coasts and our ability to burn her forests, I should say that we should have to drop bombs in the ratio of 100 to 1 to do damage equal to that which the Japanese might do.

Anyone who has lived on the desert or in the West knows the value of water, which we do not have. He knows the terror caused by forest fires which go through dry forests. To repulse the invader is one thing; but to fight a forest fire wilfully started at intervals is another thing. We are going to tremendous expense to move out of those areas persons of whom we cannot be sure. The military areas in the West are very extensive. The Army is taking every possible precaution, and every one of the C. C. C. camps will contribute to taking care of the evacuee problem in the West.

Mr. President, I desire to have my views on record. Let me say, as seriously as I can possibly say anything, that the greatest worry I have from an attack on the western coast is the ability of the enemy to drop incendiary bombs at intervals throughout our forests. That is no military secret, as was the matter to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. It is known to every schoolboy in the world. Everyone who studies geography knows that the western section of the United States is termed "desert land." It is dry most of the year.

Mr. President, I have no right to do so, but I ask the Senator from Nevada to request a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, which I am sure he will do. I want the Senate put on record in the midst of the war. I want Senators who, in the midst of war, would vote to strike down an auxiliary of the Army of the United States to bear the responsibility of doing so. I do not wish to have that responsibility weighing on my shoulders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barbour	Hill	Rosier
Blibo	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brown	Lee	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if we are to abolish a function of Government which has been created by specific legislation, if it is the intentment of the Congress to abolish something which the Congress established by law, if it is thought that the usefulness of some governmental agency has come to an end, then let us approach that subject and that problem as we approached it in the beginning, and make arrangements by legislation for the orderly dissolution and the orderly liquidation of that which has served pursuant to a law which we enacted.

To abolish unsystematically and unmethodically and thoughtlessly, if you please, an agency by merely cutting off the appropriation which enables it to function, seems to me to have but little place in an orderly legislative body. If we cut off the appropriation for this governmental agency the result will be that we will leave it unprovided for, with functions of the law unperformed. Some of the functions provided in the law are the return of the enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps to their respective homes, which is provided for under the system through which the Civilian Conservation Corps has been operating. Other functions are connected with the care of the camps and the equipment, which will be left out in the field uncared for, ungaurded, unprotected. What was purchased through hundreds of millions of dollars of governmental expenditures will be left derelict, and without any system of preservation or protection, if the bill goes through without proper amendment.

Mr. President, I am a little surprised at my good friend from Tennessee criticizing those who he has said refused information, although they promised to give information. Let me say that Mr. McEntee, who was requested by the Senator from Tennessee to give certain information, brought the information to the clerk of the committee. The information was voluminous. It could not go into the record. The clerk of the committee called the Senator and asked him if the record should be sent up to his office. He said "No." It was of such a nature, containing that which was regarded as military secrets, matters of military confidence as to the exact placement of

certain equipment in camps, that the information was returned to the office of the official furnishing it. The Senator from Tennessee has no real complaint in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall yield in a moment. I desire to finish my statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator will yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not a single item of information called for by the Senator from Tennessee was denied or refused him by any one who came before the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I asked for from The Adjutant General and the under officer in the military department was that information he furnished as to how much it cost last year to operate these camps in the areas where there was but one Civilian Conservation Corps camp, and how much it would cost to employ civilians to do the work which it is proposed to have done by the boys in these camps. He never reported back. I have a recollection of making only one request of McEntee for information and the clerk told me that he had a ton or more of material for me to examine at night. He called me about 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon; I had been through a hard day's work, and I did not intend to go through a ton of material during the evening and night.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say, in that respect, that Mr. McEntee had been that day through a cross-examination of the able Senator from Tennessee, and he had been experiencing somewhat of a hard day also. Anyone who sits under the cross-examination of the Senator from Tennessee for 1 day will remember it for some time thereafter. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Mr. McCARRAN. The able Senator from Tennessee, in opposing my amendment, says that the proposed expenditure is unnecessary and wasteful. I can only reply in the language used by the President of the United States when he sent a message through the Bureau of the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations, that this expenditure is absolutely essential. He gave two vital and specific reasons why the Civilian Conservation Corps should be retained; first, to protect the forests of America, and second, to perform duties in the military training camps of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee made another statement which to my mind is unwarranted by the record: He stated that the work of the boys in the camps would be to wait on the soldiers. That is not true; it is not borne out by the record. The record is to the contrary.

Let me state to the Senate what the boys would do, according to the testimony given to us by a representative of the Army:

Laying cable for harbor control communications.
Airport construction.
Magazine construction and firebreaks around magazines.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that the boys are being called on to do what the Army has heretofore had civilian employees do; and in that sense it seemed to me that the boys were waiting on the Army in doing whatever chores might have to be done around the Army camps.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us see if these are chores:

Coast Artillery emplacement construction.
Small gun and cannon emplacements.
Razing undesirable structures.
Artillery ranges and observation posts.
Auxiliary water-supply systems.
Equipment storage buildings and sheds.
Small dams to impound water for fire protection.
Parking areas and guardrails.
Drill fields and parade grounds construction.
Painting military buildings.
Salvaging all types of critical materials.
Camouflage work of all types.
Excavations for buildings, air-raid shelters, etc.
Installation of telephone and power lines.
Sewage-disposal systems.
Construction of sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and rock walls.
Construction and maintenance of roads and trails.
Laying water and sewer lines.
Construction of recreation areas, athletic fields, and bathhouses.
Construction of target ranges.
Survey and boundary work.
Clearing for maneuver areas.
Sawing of lumber for military purposes.
Selective cutting.
Fire hazard reduction.
Grading, top-soiling, seeding, and sodding, and planting in barracks areas and along roads and streets.
Fire fighting on reservations.
Clearing for roads and railroads.
Mosquito-control work.
Landscaping work.
Erosion-control work.
Tree preservation.
Drainage work on reservations.
Fence construction.
Moving families from military reservations.

If those things constitute waiting on soldiers, then I do not know what waiting on soldiers is. There is not a single, solitary word in the record before the committee which even indicates that the boys are called upon to wait upon soldiers. As a rule the American soldier does not ask anyone to wait on him; nor would civilian labor, if it were brought into the Army camps, wait upon the soldiers. So enough of that.

The Senator from Tennessee made much of the matter of the location of the camps, and dwelt at great length upon one subject. He asked, "Do you know where the greatest forest that belongs to the United States is located?"

My good friends the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington hastened to reply. The Senator from Washington very properly said, "In Washington." The Senator from Tennessee said, "No; not in Washington, not in Oregon, not in the Atlantic States, but in Alaska." He then said, "Not a single camp is located in Alaska."

Mr. President, the Alaskan forests, whatever they are, are protected by Nature; because in Alaska the humidity, the fall of rain and snow, the continuation and perpetuity of the snowfall, and the condition of the terrain constitute a pro-

tection to those forests. Nature protects the Alaskan forests, and there are only a minimum of fires in Alaska.

The danger exists along the great western slope from the Rockies to the Pacific, where the underbrush and under-grass become dry because of the dryness of the late season. Vast areas in the West are covered by what is known as cheat grass, which becomes so dry that shortly after the middle of July a cigarette thrown from a car at the side of a road may start a fire which may spread and burn over millions of acres, and yet damage scarcely one tree. All the farms, the countryside, the towns, the villages, and the homes in that area are subject to such fires; and in those areas the Civilian Conservation Corps has been extremely useful.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. Relative to what has just been stated by the Senator from Nevada, let me say that the Senator from Tennessee suggested that most of the camps would be located in California, where they would be of no great benefit in the work of preventing and fighting forest fires. The Senator then asked me about Michigan. I have ascertained where the camps in Michigan are located. Five of the six are located in counties in the northern part of the State, which have large forest areas and where the fire-fighting ability of the C. C. C. enrollees would be, and is, most valuable and necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me dwell on one other phase of the matter brought out by way of forceful argument by my good friend the Senator from Tennessee. He referred to 28 camps allocated to the State of California. Then he said that in the committee we were shown a map having on it a large red area indicating the forests of California. However, if he had read a little further in the record he would have found that, in reply to a question from the chairman of the committee, it was disclosed that that area is what is known as a chaparral area.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read that statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. The vast area extending north from Los Angeles to the Tehachapi Range is covered by chaparral, manzanita, and snowbush, which are among the greatest means of spreading fire. The Senator asked, "Why was not a camp placed in that area?" Of course, a camp would not be placed in the very midst of an area which might take fire, so that the camp itself would be destroyed. If a camp were so located, as much of the time of the enrollees would be required in working to protect the camp as in fighting the fire in the forest. So the camps are set apart from the forests, apart from areas which might be subject to fire.

Again, the Senator dwelt at some length on the costs of administration. Let me read what is disclosed by the testimony of Mr. McEntee in the House hearings:

Mr. ENGEL. I know about that, but let us confine ourselves to the question for the moment. You gave us a figure the other day

that of the \$49,000,000 proposed originally approximately \$21,000,000 was for administration.

Mr. McENTEE. I do not think so.

Mr. ENGEL. That is what was put in the record, I think.

Mr. TARVER. Pardon me, I think the record indicates that the \$21,000,000 will be for administration and for the purchase of materials.

Mr. ENGEL. All right; will you put in the amount for administration of that \$80,000,000?

Mr. McENTEE. Yes; stating what it consists of.

Mr. ENGEL. I want you to also put in the record the amount that is going to be used for the purchase of materials.

Mr. McENTEE. Yes.

The information requested follows: The salaries of personnel which may be classed as administrative expenses amount to a total of \$6,757,027. Of this sum \$1,523,983 is departmental and the balance of \$5,233,044 is outside of Washington. The total permanent positions in the Department are 704.3 and outside of Washington—other than camp personnel—are 2,741.7, making an aggregate of 3,456 positions which might be termed administrative.

Let me dwell on that subject for a moment. The Senator complains because the War Department has been brought into the Civilian Conservation Corps picture. That was done at the very outset by the suggestion, indeed, the wise suggestion, of the President. The War Department takes care of the enrollee from the time he leaves his home until his return, and between the hours when he is at work and the hours when he returns to work; it takes care of all the camp life, all the camp training. The Army provides the food for the enrollees and it is prepared under Army supervision. The reason for that was that the Army was better equipped and better trained to carry on that program than any other group we had at that time or have had since.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to read to the Senate and the Senator the words of his own amendment:

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, \$28,030,512.

Mr. McCARRAN. So what?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the cost of administration, as I have just stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the cost of equipment, material, and other items is brought into that \$28,000,000. Of that \$28,000,000 there will be approximately \$1,523,900 for the payment of services. The Senator knows that the statement that \$28,000,000 is to be expended in order to disburse \$28,000,000 is not borne out by the record and has no place, in fact, in this picture.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude, so far as the presentation of this matter is concerned. I desire again to suggest to the Senate what to my mind is an orderly system—an orderly way—of doing this. If, in the judgment of Congress, the Department of the Interior—and I use the Department of the Interior merely as an example—had outlived its usefulness and no longer performed a

useful function in our Government, would the orderly courageous way to dispose of the Department of the Interior be to cut off appropriations for it? Not at all. That would be the most destructive and useless way of doing it. I apply the same principle here. If the Civilian Conservation Corps has outlived its usefulness, if it is a function set up by congressional act which we now think should be done away with, let us be courageous about it, and say to the people of this country by a legislative act we did away with the Civilian Conservation Corps, not by cutting its throat and allowing it to stand as a skeleton, and losing that which has been invested by the Government in it.

I leave the amendment with the Senate, and I ask for a ye-a-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is out of the city and not able to be present for the vote on the C. C. C. amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD prior to the ye-a-and-nay vote on the amendment an editorial written by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin captioned "The folly of wrecking C. C. C."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOLLY OF WRECKING CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

For 9 years the Civilian Conservation Corps has stood out as one of the finest organizations set up by the Federal Government. It has done a splendid job, and the general public has almost universally acclaimed it. Throughout those 9 years, it has been building roads, improving our forests, developing our parks, preventing soil erosion, fighting fires, and performing heroic services in areas that have suffered disaster from wind, flood, or fire.

More than that, it has been building health and character among nearly 3,000,000 boys who have been enrolled in the Corps.

Yet in the face of this great record there is a grave possibility that the entire organization, the whole program, and the fruits of 9 years of experience in building the Civilian Conservation Corps will be destroyed. The House of Representatives, by a very small margin, has refused to provide any appropriations to continue the Civilian Conservation Corps beyond July 1. It is now up to the Senate to decide whether it wishes to acquiesce or fight for the reinstatement of the item in the appropriation bill.

WORKING FOR THE ARMY

There is no reasonable question of the Civilian Conservation Corps' importance to the Nation's war effort. Time and time again in recent months when the Civilian Conservation Corps has been under consideration in congressional committees, representatives from both the Army and Navy have enthusiastically praised the work it has been doing.

Approximately 150 camps are now doing important work for the Army in developing military reservations, and Mr. McEntee, Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, has testified that the Army has requested more than 50 camps in addition to this number, with every prospect that still more may be needed later.

These Civilian Conservation Corps boys are building roads, bridges, clearing out gunnery ranges, and doing a wide variety of jobs essential to putting the Army's training grounds

in usable condition. The soil-erosion work, much of the conservation work, and the other peacetime jobs have had to be sacrificed to meet the needs of the Army in this emergency, showing how important the Civilian Conservation Corps is to our armed forces.

But there is another compelling reason why the Civilian Conservation Corps should not be abolished. Not much is being said publicly about it, but informed people know that we may be face to face this year with a very real menace here at home—the menace of forest fires.

EFFECT ON FOREST FIRES

This is war, and the enemy is not likely to overlook the havoc that can be wrought by forest fires, especially in the Northwest, where millions of acres of precious timberland lie exposed to saboteurs or even raiding airplanes.

The United States Forest Service reports that in some areas they have relied on the Civilian Conservation Corps for 75 to 85 percent of the manpower necessary for forest-fire protection. The Civilian Conservation Corps boys are the best fire fighters the Forest Service has ever had.

The State forester of West Virginia reported last year that "reduction of camps resulted in 20 percent increase in areas burned in areas having camps last spring." Kentucky reported, "Burned 20,000 acres; could have held to 10,000 if 1941 Civilian Conservation Corps camps available." Massachusetts protested, "Efficiency reduced 65 percent by loss of Civilian Conservation Corps camps." The same story comes in from State after State.

It certainly is not economy to abandon the Civilian Conservation Corps in the face of these facts. The cost of operating the Civilian Conservation Corps is small compared with the losses that may be suffered from a few disastrous fires. The Civilian Conservation Corps is a very real form of fire insurance, and this is the worst conceivable time to think of defaulting on the premium.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS BOYS MAKE BETTER SOLDIERS

It is claimed that the Civilian Conservation Corps is unable to enroll enough boys to keep going at full strength; at the same time the Army is hinting that it may ask for the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years old for military service.

Responsible officials of the Civilian Conservation Corps are confident that they can secure enough enrollees to maintain 350 camps, and possibly more. With 350 camps, it is estimated that about 90 would be placed in the forest areas and the rest devoted to work on military reservations.

Furthermore, Army officers have testified repeatedly to the effect that Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees are much better prepared for military training than men who have not had this type of experience. They have been built up physically. In the course of its existence the Civilian Conservation Corps has rehabilitated over a half a million youths and raised them from a condition where they could not pass the physical requirements to a condition satisfactory for enrollment.

It has provided vocational training such as the Army needs. It has been stated that 25 percent of the Army cooks today were formerly in the Civilian Conservation Corps. It has been training radio technicians, auto mechanics, photographers, map makers, skilled medical orderlies, truck and tractor operators, aircraft assembly mechanics—every one a skill of great value to the Army.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has been doing a very important job in the Nation's war effort with efficiency and commendable results. It has, furthermore, latent possibilities for still greater service in either war or peace.

To scrap an organization with such a constructive record would not be economy; it would be folly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], on which the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent from the city. If he were present and voting on this question, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BONE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] would vote "yea" and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on public business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

I also announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] who would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 32, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—32		
Alken	Hayden	Norris
Andrews	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Kilgore	Pepper
Bone	Lee	Rosier
Brown	Lucas	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Schwartz
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Doxey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Green	Murdock	Wagner
Guffey	Murray	
NAYS—32		
Bailey	Gerry	Shipstead
Ball	Gurney	Smith
Bankhead	Hughes	Stewart
Barbour	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	McKellar	Tunnell
Burton	Maloney	Tydings
Butler	Maybank	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Nye	White
Connally	Radcliffe	Willis
George	Reed	
NOT VOTING—32		
Austin	Davis	Overtton
Barkley	Gillette	Reynolds
Brewster	Glass	Smathers
Brooks	Hatch	Spencer
Bulow	Herring	Taft
Bunker	Holman	Tobey
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Van Nuys
Chandler	Langer	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 32, the nays are 32. The Senate being equally divided, the Chair votes in the affirmative.

So Mr. McCARRAN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's motion is not in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the motion of the Senator from Tennessee be laid on the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Vice President has just decided that the motion was out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order, having been made by a Senator who voted on the losing side. The request for reconsideration must be made by one voting on the prevailing side.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. Aiken answered in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nevada made a motion that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered. The Senator from Alabama attempted to make a motion to lay that motion on the table. Are we now voting to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, or are we voting to reconsider the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. HILL. I wanted that made clear.

Mr. Aiken. I understood we were voting to reconsider the vote, and I voted in the negative. On the vote to lay on the table, I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote in the affirmative is a vote to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, and a vote in the negative is a vote against it being laid on the table. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I announce my pair as on the previous vote and withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea," and also that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] would vote "yea" and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

I announce the following general pair:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

I also announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 32, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—32

Alken	Hayden	Norris
Andrews	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Kilgore	Pepper
Bone	Lee	Rosier
Brown	Lucas	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Schwartz
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Doxey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Green	Murdock	Wagner
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—32

Bailey	George	Reed
Ball	Gerry	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gurney	Smith
Barbour	Hughes	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McKellar	Tydings
Butler	Maoney	Walsh
Byrd	Maybank	Wheeler
Capper	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Willis
Connally	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Barkley	Glass	Smathers
Brewster	Hatch	Spencer
Brooks	Herring	Taft
Bulow	Holman	Tobey
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chandler	Langer	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wallgren
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wiley
Davis	Overtone	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 32, the nays are 32. The Senate being equally divided, the Chair votes in the affirmative.

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement, if I may. When the vote was taken on the motion to lay on the table the motion for reconsideration of the vote by which the so-called McCarran amendment was agreed to, my colleague the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] had had to leave the Chamber, so he was absent when the vote was taken. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I wish to have this announcement appear in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with the exception of Senate amendment numbered 6, and that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and that they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 337. An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books; and

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

INSPIRATION TO INCREASE SCRAP-RUBBER COLLECTION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as we know, the American people have been called upon by the President to gather scrap rubber. The campaign is now in full sway, and progress has been made and much rubber gathered. This morning I received a letter from a 5-year-old girl who lives at Independence, La. I should like to read her letter into the RECORD. Accompanying her letter is her dolly, which she sent to me. It is a rubber doll. I now hold it in my hands for all Members of the Senate to see. I wish I could have it incorporated in

the RECORD, with all of the inscriptions appearing on it.

The young lady's letter is dated Independence, La., June 20, 1942, and reads as follows:

INDEPENDENCE, LA., June 20, 1942.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I must do my bit, so I am sending to you my rubber dolly, for Mummy said the scrap-rubber collection is your idea.

I am 5 years old. I love my dolly, but love our Uncle Sam better. And it will be good if all the little girls would give up their rubber dollies.

May God bless our President and you.

Sincerely,

MISS BEVERLY ANN PECORA.

On the rubber doll is inscribed the young lady's name, "Beverly Ann Pecora, 5 years old." On the right foot of the doll is an inscription, "Kick them with this footie." [Laughter.] On one side of the head is inscribed, "Soak the Japs for me, baby." [Laughter.] On the other side of the head is the inscription "Go get 'em, baby." [Laughter.]

I wish that all the young people of the Nation would add their efforts to those of this patriotic youngster so as to increase our much-needed rubber supply. I desire to congratulate this young constituent of mine for sacrificing her dolly, and I predict that should such a spirit of sacrifice predominate in this country it will mean a quick end to the war.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$696,000."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I may say that the amendment involves a very small amount of money, the sum of \$396,000. I have been reliably informed that at least one member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, which first cut this appropriation from the amount fixed by the Budget, to which my amendment would restore the figure, has changed his views, and that if the Senate puts the amount back there is a fair chance that the House committee will agree to it. I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not accept that amendment?

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. To what does the amendment refer?

Mr. BROWN. The amendment proposes that the sum of \$396,000, which was

cut from the Budget estimate for the training of apprentices, shall be restored.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am content to take this matter to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I propose a clarifying amendment on page 66, after line 12. On that page there is a provision—

That no portion of the sum herein appropriated—

That is for social security—

Shall be expended by any Federal agency for the salary of any person who is engaged more than half of the time, as determined by the State director of unemployment compensation.

Nothing is said about the time when that shall take effect. Unless the time is fixed a great deal of confusion in the accounts of all the different States will result. So, without changing the meaning of the language of the bill, I suggest adding the following at the end of line 12:

This proviso shall be applicable as to the first pay roll after the State director shall have made the determination in question; and such determination, when made, shall remain in effect for the period covered by this appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I discussed the matter with the Senator at the beginning of the session today, and I am content to take his amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

This proviso shall be applicable as to the first pay roll after the State director shall have made the determination in question; and such determination, when made, shall remain in effect for the period covered by this appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 7181 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7184, Calendar 1557.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7184) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am about to make a rather unusual request. Rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate reads as follows:

RULE XXXV. SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS

On a motion made and seconded to close the doors of the Senate, on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed.

I now move that the doors be closed. I should like to make a brief explanation. The bill under consideration will necessitate—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that he make his explanation before making the motion.

Mr. WALSH. I think that is proper. I accept the Chair's suggestion.

The bill under consideration will of necessity require a discussion and presentation of the policy of the Navy with relation to the building of battleships and airplane carriers, and perhaps open up some other aspects of our Navy problem that ought not, in my opinion, or in the opinion of the Navy, to be discussed in public, lest it be helpful to the enemy. While there have been rumors about what that policy of the Navy is, yet it has not been authentically stated, and I am in a position, from information given to me by the Navy, to state that policy as I understand it. There is nothing sensational about the request for a session with closed doors. Nothing extreme or alarming is going to be said by me in executive session, but it is my judgment, and it is the judgment of those of my colleagues with whom I have discussed this matter, that in the interest of our own country, and its welfare and its military defenses, the discussion ought to be held behind closed doors.

I move that the doors be closed, that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of legislative business in secret session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) proceeded to deliberate with closed doors.

At 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., on motion of Mr. WALSH, the doors were reopened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I send forward an amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "battleships"; and on page 3, line 13, before the period, to insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no battleship shall be constructed after the date of the enactment of this act under authorization heretofore made unless the construction of such battleship has been commenced, or a contract for such construction has been made, prior to such date of enactment."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this amendment would merely have the effect of enacting into law the policy which has been announced on behalf of the Navy Department, that they have no intention at the present time of constructing any more battleships. It seems to me that, inasmuch as the bill itself contemplates a program which will occupy all the facilities of the United States for some time to come, there is no necessity or desirability for the whole authorization to be left in effect. If it should later be determined by the Navy Department that it were necessary to build a battleship, it has been demonstrated that there would be no delay in the consideration of their request, and it seems to me that it would be better for the Treasury and better for the whole program to have a definite policy enacted.

I do not intend any reflection on the policy of the Navy Department or of anyone else, but it is merely sound, common business sense.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me ask him if any of the battleships or how many of the battleships have been contracted for.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Massachusetts can answer that question better than I can.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I gave that information in executive session.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts did not wish to give that information in open session, and that is one of the reasons why we went into session with closed doors.

Mr. HUGHES. We are not now in a session with closed doors; we are in open session.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts did not want to give that information in open session, so we went into session with closed doors.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri amounts to freezing any further building of battleships by the Navy until further action shall be taken by the Congress. I regret that I am unable to accept the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I personally feel that we should rely upon the assurance of the Navy that they will not undertake to build any further battleships without conferring with the Naval Committees of Congress. In the closed session I gave at length the views of the Navy Department on this subject, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not for a moment question the intention of the

Navy Department as expressed to the Naval Affairs Committee. But policies of importance are changed from time to time, sometimes without notice, and it seems to me that the evidence is overwhelming, and acquiesced in by the Navy itself, against the further construction of battleships at this time. If the amendment were enacted, if the Navy should change its mind as to the desirability of building battleships, and if it should conclude that the available facilities and the available material should be diverted back to battleships, it should come to Congress and announce the change of policy before it proceeded under an old authorization. I have no desire to detain the Senate at great length on the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote down the pending amendment. I do not think it appropriate for one to present an amendment which will provoke debate on questions that we discussed today in secret session. I could advance many reasons to show why the amendment should be defeated, but I would have to resort to certain information which I deem confidential. In the past the Senate has simply authorized that a certain designated tonnage be built into warships and the type of each ship was left entirely in the discretion of the Navy Department. At times, as in the pending bill, a certain specified tonnage is stipulated for a certain class of ships, but never is the number of ships designated.

The reason for that is patent. We should not let the enemy know the number and type of ships we contemplate building, nor should we let him know that we will discard certain types. Events may occur within a short period that will compel us to build the battleships and cruisers that have been temporarily deferred and it would be to our decided advantage to keep the enemy guessing.

I believe the Navy Department has done and is now doing a good job under such a system. It is now actively putting all of its force behind our war effort and I believe it would be unwise to make changes at this time.

I repeat, Mr. President, my earnest hope that the Senate vote to defeat the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to record my hearty agreement with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. I hope Congress will not undertake to tie the hands of the Navy. The Navy knows much better than does the Senate what vessels it needs and when it needs them. I am perfectly willing to trust to the responsible authorities of the Navy as to whether or not any type of ships shall be constructed.

We are in the most tremendous struggle in which this country has ever been involved. We need the Navy, we need aircraft, we need armies, and for God's sake let the Senate not set up its judgment as to the different classifications of ships we should have, and when, and how they should be built.

I am willing to stand by the naval authorities. I think it would be a serious

mistake for the Senate in this hasty fashion to undertake to lay down a naval policy with respect to when and where and how some particular classification of ships shall be constructed. We heard in the closed session the very fine and complete statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and it seems to me that everyone who heard the statement ought to be convinced that we should not adopt the amendment; that we should not intervene in the Navy's plans in respect to this matter.

I was particularly struck by certain portions of the Senator's statement in which he made it very clear that the time of the battleship is not past; that its utility is still necessary in certain situations, in contests of long range and of heavy armaments. So I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment of my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Texas has said about the very impressive and weighty statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts in closed session. To my mind, that statement conclusively proves that battleships ought not to be built at this time. To my mind, the statement of the Navy Department itself that the building of battleships is to be indefinitely postponed makes the amendment desirable. The amendment is not a reflection on the Navy. It is not an attempt to override the discretion of the Navy. Its purpose is simply to enact into law the policy which the Navy Department itself has adopted and announced.

Why should we leave an authorization hanging over, to be carried into effect years from now, when the whole situation may have changed, as it has already changed since the authorization was originally made? If the Navy Department next month changes its mind and sends us a recommendation for the construction of battleships, we know that both bodies of Congress will give favorable consideration to any recommendation the Navy Department may make. The amendment does not make any reflection on the Navy. It is not even calling attention to the change in the policy which the Navy has seen fit to make by reason of the limitation of our facilities and by reason of desirable priority with respect to materials. The Navy Department, like every one else, has learned from the lessons of this war. But it is a fact that it is not intended to pursue the building of battleships, and if the program of naval building contemplated in this very bill is to be carried forward in the most expeditious manner, battleships cannot be built. The amendment simply provides for leaving that to the future determination of Congress on the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committees. So far from the amendment being any reflection upon the Navy Department, or upon the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], as suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I desire to say that I submitted this amendment yesterday to the Senator from Massa-

chusetts, and it at that time met with his approval.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who was first on his feet.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation when the Senator shall have concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Missouri feel that the adoption of his amendment would change our policy with respect to the method of authorizing the building of warships? Ever since I have been in the Senate, we have simply authorized that a specified tonnage of warships be built, and left the size, the tonnage of each ship, and other characteristics to the sole discretion of the Navy Department. I am of opinion that the adoption of the Senator's amendment would change that policy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the amendment carries out the policy announced by the Navy Department itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I subscribe to the sentiments which have been expressed in opposition to the amendment. I respect the convictions and the opinion of the able Senator from Missouri. Certainly on the surface of things it appears that his opinion is in accord with the trend.

I think the observation of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is very pertinent. No hearing has been held by the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the matter. I have no technical information before me concerning it. No committee report has been made upon such a proposal. I do not think the Senate should be called upon to pass its judgment on a matter of broad policy such as this, even though we respect the sincerity and conviction of the Senator from Missouri and even if many of us may superficially have an inclination to vote favorably on such a proposal. I think the matter is a technical one, and that it should be left constantly flexible and subject to the changing judgment and timely conviction of the Navy Department, and at this late hour in the afternoon, when the Senate has not had the advantage of technical knowledge or a recommendation by the committee, I hope the Senator will not feel obligated to press the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make a similar observation. Not being a member of the Naval Affairs Committee but having complete faith in the Navy, I think it would be wise not to do anything which might in any way affect the great work which the Navy is doing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand the announced policy with respect to what the Navy proposes to do, it was not an abandonment at all of the building of battleships, but it was rather indicated that they needed other vessels at the moment more than they needed battleships, and simply deferred

the building of them until they could go ahead with other instrumentalities of naval warfare.

I shall not vote tonight to send a message to the Mikado, "Come on over; we are not going to have any battleships to resist you." I shall not vote to tell the European Axis Powers to come on over; that we are not to have any more battleships; that the Senate is to act as the Secretary of the Navy from now on, and that we are to decide what kind of vessels are to be built and when they shall be built. I believe the policy of the Navy can be trusted, and that battleships for certain functions, as already indicated by those who know, are still useful. I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Texas does not have to vote for any amendment for which he does not want to vote. The Senator from Texas is pursuing the course of simply setting up a straw man for the purpose of knocking him down when he asserts that he will not send a message to the Mikado or to Hitler. The policy of the Navy Department was very perfectly stated in the letter written to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]:

The Navy Department has deferred indefinitely the construction of the last five battleships authorized by the Congress, and before undertaking the further construction of these battleships the Navy Department will consult the Naval Affairs Committees of the two bodies of Congress in these respects.

It seems to me the Navy Department might as well consult the two committees of the Congress.

My amendment proposes to write into the law the announced policy of the Navy Department itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7184) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I had intended to move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6, which refers to an appropriation for the Territory of Hawaii which was inserted in the bill in the committee; but I am told by our leader that he has some agreement with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. Under those circumstances, I

should rather have the matter go over until Monday. I should like to have it disposed of. I now give notice that at the earliest time when I can obtain recognition on Monday I shall make a motion to recede from the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be passed over until Monday.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Vice President be authorized to sign bills, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that during the adjournment of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations may have permission to file reports on bills and resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF DR. JO M. FERGUSON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 229)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning, without my approval, S. 819, 77th Congress, "An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson," which would direct the Veterans' Administration to cancel an alleged overpayment in the sum of \$7,051.94, charged against Dr. Jo M. Ferguson for disabled emergency officers' retirement payments received by him, and to pay to the widow and children of Dr. Ferguson the sum of \$7,666.21, as the net balance of insurance policy K-18334 issued to Dr. Ferguson and the civil-service-retirement fund credited to Dr. Ferguson at the time of his death on September 21, 1938.

It appears that on August 3, 1920, while an employee of the Government, Dr. Ferguson filed an application for disability compensation based on his service as a captain in the Medical Corps of the Army from October 18, 1918, to July 11, 1919, setting forth the disabilities which he contended had been incurred as the result of such service. This contention was supported by affidavit evidence upon the basis of which a disability rating was granted, and Dr. Ferguson received disability compensation, pension, and emergency officers' retirement pay, totaling \$10,084.76.

It further appears that as a result of an investigation of the case, the Veterans' Administration found that Dr. Fer-

guson knowingly and intentionally submitted false evidence in support of his claim for compensation in violation of the provisions of section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, and that as a consequence he forfeited all rights and claims and benefits to which he otherwise might be entitled. This finding was reviewed on appeal and sustained, and the veteran's rights declared forfeited. The amount which had been paid Dr. Ferguson, \$10,084.76, therefore became an overpayment, or, in other words, a debt due the United States.

Against the overpayment to Dr. Ferguson of \$10,084.76, the Veterans' Administration computed credits, at the time of his death on September 21, 1938, of \$10,699.03, this amount being composed of the balance due on his Government insurance policy together with salary deductions to his credit in the civil-service-retirement fund. The total credits, therefore, exceeded the total indebtedness by \$614.27.

The present enactment does not question the finding of fraud in this case, but, in effect, holds that the penalty attached to such finding, as prescribed by section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, should be applied only to the disability compensation and pension paid, and should not run against emergency officers' retirement payments of \$7,051.94. Thus, the enactment provides for the cancellation of the overpayment charge on account of the emergency officers' retirement payments, and for the payment to Dr. Ferguson's widow and children of the equivalent amount of the overpayment charge, and of the excess credit of \$614.27, or a total payment of \$7,666.21.

I find myself unable to subscribe to the view that the finding of fraud in this case should not be considered applicable to the emergency officers' retirement payments. Emergency officers' retirement pay is provided in lieu of disability compensation. The law providing for payment of disability compensation and the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act, as amended, are inseparable in material aspects. Section 504 has been uniformly construed as requiring forfeiture for fraud of emergency officers' retirement pay, as well as disability compensation, and this ruling has been consistently followed in every case in which forfeiture for fraud has been imposed and has never been overruled in any final court proceeding. To construe the law otherwise in the instant case would result in granting the widow and children of Dr. Ferguson benefits which have been denied to many others similarly situated.

For these reasons I feel obliged to withhold my approval of this bill.

I desire, however, to inform the Congress that I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that, in accordance with the provisions of Public, No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940, which have the effect of prohibiting further collection of Dr. Ferguson's indebtedness from the proceeds of his Government insurance policy, the net balance of such policy in the amount of \$6,359—which represents

a major portion of the amount of the payment contemplated by the present enactment—is payable in equal shares, upon application therefor, to Dr. Ferguson's widow and the two children.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 26, 1942.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business. The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment or promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers of the Reserve Corps and Army of the United States for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I report two routine nominations for temporary appointments in the Army, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Carl Raymond Gray, Jr., Corps of Engineers (Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 37, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved June 15, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under Public Law No. 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 22, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are two nominations on the calendar which, under a previous agreement, I ask to have go over. One is the nomination of James Lawrence Fly to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, a re-appointment, and the other is the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey. I ask that those two nominations go over until Monday, under a previous agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSUL GENERAL

Sam E. Woods, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Charles Lowman Decker, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JUNE 19, 1942

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Riley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Carl Raymond Gray, Jr.
William Henry Harrison

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

William S. Griffiths, Opa Locka.

MICHIGAN

Otto E. Farwell, Barryton.
Rhea Henderson, Kingston.
Earl G. Abbott, Sterling.

MINNESOTA

John M. Donlin, Arlington.
Teresa L. Wolf, Staples.
Leonard L. Krouss, Stewart.
Lura V. Frahm, Triumph.

NEW MEXICO

James H. Bell, Mesilla Park.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wythe M. Peyton, Asheville.
Berder B. Long, Cullowhee.
James J. Parker, Murfreesboro.
Wilbur R. Doshier, Wilmington.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas B. Hallman, Aiken.
Pretto H. White, Ehrhardt.
Lorna M. Hutson, Hardeeville.
George M. Faile, Kershaw.
James M. Muirhead, Mount Pleasant.
William S. Gibson, Sharon.
George C. Cartwright, York.

TEXAS

Oscar W. Koym, East Bernard.

VIRGINIA

Thomas W. Cooke, Gloucester.
Marcellus B. Garnett, Mathews.
Eddie L. Southard, Stanardsville.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Fisher, Moorefield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, pastor of Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art the author and sustainer of life, the help of all who put their trust in Thee, we pause in Thy presence to pray that our lives may be built, not upon shifting sands but upon the rock of eternal truth. Help us to keep ourselves, our homes, and our Nation dedicated to Thee and to the cause of truth, of justice, and of freedom upon the earth.

Deliver us from all superficiality, from all half-truths, and from a too indulgent living. Discipline our lives that we may see clearly, talk intelligently, walk courageously, and faithfully do our duty to Thee and to our country, whose we are and whom we endeavor to serve.

We pray in the name of Him who ever summons the human spirit to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness, our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Russell, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Bridges to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Russell, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Bridges to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill 6709 entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments Nos. 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6845) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Hayden, Mr. McKellar, Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. O'Mahoney, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Holman to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3398) entitled "An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Ellender, and Mr. Wiley to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to

the bill (H. R. 4355) entitled "An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Rosier, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4370) entitled "An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Ellender, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4953) entitled "An act for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Tunnell, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5385) entitled "An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Rosier, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5449) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant)," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Ellender, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5496) entitled "An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Rosier, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5499) entitled "An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Roy Daley and Norman Franklin Daley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5920) entitled "An act for the relief of E. A. Williams," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Brown, Mr. Ellender, and Mr.

Capper to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4153. An act for the relief of Cleaver Kelley; and

H. R. 5439. An act for the relief of Joseph Soulek.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) entitled "An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. Barkley and Mr. Brewster members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Security Agency.

THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF CHILE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA:

The Chamber of Deputies of Chile has been informed of the cordial message of greeting which the House of Representatives of the United States sent to it and the evidences of gratitude expressed therein because of having had the honor of receiving in its midst the friendly visit made by a delegation of honorable members of parliament of the great sister nation. This chamber must say to your high body that the fate which enabled it to give warm greetings to your illustrious members has served, because of the kind and cordial words which were exchanged on that occasion, to tighten yet more the bonds of deep and fraternal friendship which unites the two countries. The Chamber of Deputies of Chile, in acknowledging your message, expresses fervent wishes for the prosperity of the great country of the north and for the welfare of its most worthy representatives. In transmitting this resolution of the chamber over which I preside, I wish to express to you my own feelings of friendship for the United States of North America and my warmest wishes for your personal happiness. May God keep you.

PEDRO CASTELBLANCO AGUIERO

L. ASTABURUAGA,

For the Secretary.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following letter from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D. C., June 23, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Early this year Mr. John Marshall Gamble of Santa Barbara, Calif., sent to me a very old silver ladle which belonged to Jonathan Dayton, Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1795 to 1799.

I thought this might be a very interesting thing for you to have in the House of Representatives to exhibit with my compliments and those of Mr. Gamble. If you do not have any facilities for exhibiting it, you might send it to the National Museum.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the other business of the House, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, which appeared in the Infantry Journal for June, entitled "Two Views of War," a very interesting and informative discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUFF of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, together with the Senate amendments thereto, be laid before the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would suggest that all amendments, except amendment No.

6, be taken up together and considered at once.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make that as a part of my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1942, \$50,000."

Page 4, after line 16, insert:

"UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON"

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$5,000 for the expenses of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, contained in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, and continued available for the fiscal year 1942 by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 6, after line 9, insert:

"For the payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500), \$1,250."

Page 8, after line 11, insert:

"Orchard rehabilitation loans: Not to exceed \$400,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for 'Orchard rehabilitation loans' made available for 1942 in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 8, after line 11, insert:

"FOREST SERVICE

"Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency): The first proviso in the item 'Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency)' in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of forest-fire prevention and suppression.'"

Page 13, line 18, after "in" insert "Senate Document No. 218 and."

Page 13, line 19, strike out "\$1,792.47" and insert "\$1,963.04."

Page 13, after line 19, insert:

"BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: The appropriation 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel' for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the pay and allowances, authorized by law, of the personnel provided for under this head."

Page 19, after line 13, insert:

"International Committee on Political Refugees: The unexpended balance of the appropriation 'International Committee on Political Refugees,' continued available to June 30, 1942, by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 19, after line 13, insert:

"Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico: The unexpended bal-

ance of the appropriation 'Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico,' made available for 1942 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 19, after line 14, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Treasury Department: For transfer to the Post Office Department to cover registry fees and postage on mailings of bonds issued under the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act of 1936, fiscal year 1942, \$6,000."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case,' approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 219, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Executive Office of the President."

"Coordinator of Information, \$103.95."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Federal Security Agency, \$563.35."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Federal Works Administration, \$999."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Department of the Interior, \$1,052.73."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Navy Department, \$463.70."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"War Department, \$14,509.20."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"In all, \$17,691.93."

Page 23, line 8, after "in" insert "Senate Document numbered 221 and."

Page 23, after line 14, insert:

"War Department, \$870."

Page 23, line 15, strike out "\$6,674.27" and insert "\$7,544.27."

Page 25, line 14, after "in" insert "Senate Document Numbered 220 and."

Page 25, line 18, strike out "\$13,629.90" and insert "\$84,111.62."

Page 26, line 1, strike out "\$124,655.05" and insert "\$127,325.31."

Page 26, line 3, strike out "\$41,657.69" and insert "\$47,346.17."

Page 26, line 4, strike out "\$412,805.74" and insert "\$491,646.20."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1939 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, there is appropriated as follows."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"Independent Offices: For Interstate Commerce Commission, \$5."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, \$4.33."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Branch, Procurement Division, \$29.75."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For repair, preservation, and equipment, public buildings, Procurement Division, \$7.80."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, \$27.62."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Department of Agriculture: For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, \$231."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For salaries and expenses, Extension Service, \$1.49."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), \$344.12."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act of June 28, 1937), \$154.85."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, \$14.13."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For development of water facilities, arid and semiarid areas, Department of Agriculture, \$3.50."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, \$167.91."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, \$21.73."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For National Industrial Recovery, Interior, soil-erosion prevention (transfer to Agriculture), \$45.50."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer to Farm Credit Administration), \$37."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Department of Commerce: For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, \$513.80."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Department of the Interior: For industry among Indians, \$4.59."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Department of Justice: For miscellaneous expenses, United States Courts, \$12.27."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, \$30.82."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Department of Labor: For salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor, \$23.27."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Navy Department: For aviation, Navy, \$371.76."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, \$9,843.82."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, \$37.27."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, \$23.52."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Treasury Department: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, \$976.14."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, \$9.90."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For Air Corps, Army, \$55.75."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For Army transportation, \$27.05."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For barracks and quarters, Army, \$22.27."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For National Guard, \$4.79."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For Organized Reserves, \$34.12."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For pay, and so forth, of the Army, \$106."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For pay of the Army, \$11.55."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, \$1.72."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For replacing clothing and equipage, \$18.-427.84."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For clothing and equipage, Army, \$10.-167.04."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), \$9,381.45."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, Act June 22, 1936), \$3.60."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For rent, light, fuel, and water, \$240."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
 "Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), \$51,426.07, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office."

Page 37, line 15, after "in" insert "Senate Document No. 222 and."

Page 37, line 17, strike out "\$29,429.93" and insert "\$31,848.49."

Page 38, after line 5, insert:
 "Sec. 208. For payment of interest on claim of the State of Vermont for \$7,322.48, settled by the Comptroller General in accordance with Public Law 199, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 30, 1941, and which has been certified to the Seventy-seventh Congress in Senate Document No. 223, \$232.31."

Page 39, after line 17, insert:
 "Sec. 304. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein for the fiscal year 1943 shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Page 39, line 18, strike out "304" and insert "305."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Senate returns the bill with a total of 74 amendments, adding \$208,899.90 to the amount carried by the bill as it left the House.

The Senate amendments may be said to fall into three general categories, as follows:

First, there are judgments and claims against the Government which are authorized and which have been duly adjudicated aggregating \$151,479.90. Of course, there is nothing to do but to pay them.

Second, there is an item of \$50,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate. Of course, that is a matter of the domestic economy of the Senate and concerns their housekeeping bills.

Third, there is \$6,000 for the reimbursement of the Post Office Department by the Treasury Department for handling adjusted-service bonds. That is automatic and is the minimum that could be provided for the purpose.

There are also a few reappropriations which involve no additional funds.

There is nothing controversial in any of these amendments, and the subcommittee in charge of the bill, and the conferees on the part of the House are unanimous in recommending their approval. That leaves only one amendment still undisposed of, amendment No. 6, and after disposition of the pending motion, it is my purpose to ask the House to take separate action on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has clearly stated the question and I shall not have any objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments referred to. The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask now that Senate amendment numbered 6 be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 11, after line 3, insert:

"Relief and civilian defense, Hawaii: In providing for the protection, care, and relief of the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii, for which an allocation of \$15,000,000 was made to the Secretary of the Interior from the appropriation 'Emergency fund for the President', contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942 (allocation letter No. 42-56, dated January 12, 1942), receipts from sales of materials, supplies, or foodstuff, and from charges for furnishing services and facilities, acquired or furnished thereunder, shall be deposited to the credit of said allocation and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes thereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment sets up a revolving fund in connection with a Presidential allocation of \$15,000,000 for relief in the Hawaiian Islands. It seems to the House committee that this is subject to question. We doubt the wisdom of providing a revolving fund from executive allocated moneys. Under the circumstance the committee is inclined to recommend that needs of this character be considered by direct appropriation.

I move, therefore, that Senate amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Enemies We Fight."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY ELIE LESCOT, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from the Honorable John Campbell White, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Port-au-Prince, Haiti, together with a letter from His Excellency Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti. This correspondence concerns the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives expressing thanks for the hospitality accorded the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Depart-

ment of State when it visited Haiti recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

LEGATION OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA,
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, June 13, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman of the Subcommittee of
the Appropriations Committee of
the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: I had the pleasure of delivering to President Lescot the other day the handsomely bound resolution of the House of Representatives expressing thanks for his hospitality at the time of your visit to Haiti.

He has requested me to convey his thanks to the House. In this respect I cannot do better than to enclose copies, with English translation, of his letter.

I trust that you are well and that we may have the pleasure of seeing you again down here before long.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. WHITE.

[Enclosures.]

[Translation]

NATIONAL PALACE,
Port-au-Prince, June 10, 1942.

His Excellency Mr. J. C. WHITE,
Envoy Extraordinary and
Minister Plenipotentiary,
Legation of the United States
of America, Port-au-Prince.

SIR: I take pleasure in acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 8th of June current, under cover of which I was especially pleased to find the beautiful, magnificently presented resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States. I shall always keep it as a precious possession.

I was profoundly touched by this gesture of the Representatives of your country which is in line with all the steps that they undertake, and I request you to be my interpreter to them, and to tell them of the pleasure which they have given me and to transmit to them my lively thanks.

I avail myself of this occasion, sir, to renew to you the assurance of my high consideration.

E. LESCOT.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that beginning today, and until July 1, it may be in order for the House to consider conference reports on appropriation bills, notwithstanding the fact that the conference reports have not been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, because I believe that is necessary in order to complete the work of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, but I do feel that before these reports are called up reasonable notice should be given to the membership that they are coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman from New York says, and I might say that in the agreement with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that was thoroughly understood. However, that was something that could not well be put in a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TABER. It is thoroughly understood.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and I would be very glad to suggest whatever reasonable period the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. TABER. There ought to be time enough for the members of the committee to be here and there ought to be time enough before a vote is taken to at least give Members a telephone ring on both sides that the matter is coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that that will happen. I think we can leave that rest safely in the hands of the Speaker.

Mr. TABER. I think that is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SCRAP RUBBER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no accurate knowledge as to how much rubber exists in various governmental departments and agencies and buildings under their supervision, including the buildings we ourselves occupy. I do want to suggest, however, in connection with the current drive to collect all possible scrap rubber that, as a means of setting an example the heads of all governmental agencies and departments might appoint emergency committees for the purpose of seeing to it that all possible available rubber scrap in any governmental agency be delivered over to the scrap drive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Would it not be a good idea for the Government to take over all these rubber mats that are in the House Office Buildings and the Senate Office Building?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is one of the things I had in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pataskala (Ohio) Standard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS HAS ALWAYS VOTED LIBERAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OUR PACIFIC POSSESSIONS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTRA COPIES OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have had several inquiries from Members of Congress as to whether they can get additional copies of the report from the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Union for Democratic Action, in its attempt to purge Members of Congress. Upon inquiry I find from the secretary of our committee that there were only 1,000 copies printed. That means less than an average of two for each Member. The secretary also informs me that one Member of Congress has asked for 250 copies.

There is a way to solve this problem but it is up to the House and not to our committee; that is, to introduce a resolution to have printed the necessary number of copies of this report if you desire them.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I feel the Superintendent of the House document room can have a House report reprinted without a resolution. The reason I think we should be careful about passing resolutions of this kind is this: One of the select committees had the House Committee on Printing bring in a resolution to print 9,000 copies of every hearing they held. Those hearings are piled in the halls of the Old House Office Building and most of them never have been used. They further rented a basement of a house on C Street at \$20 a month to store those hearings. The Committee on Accounts told them to get the hearings out of that basement or pay the rent themselves.

Mr. MASON. I had nothing like that in mind. I am simply presenting the problem to the House and it can do as it pleases.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago there was a splendid resolution passed in this House with reference to our flag. At that time the question was brought up as to whether or not there were places in the United States which

the law required the flag to be flown 24 hours a day. There is no law on the statute books which requires that it shall float 24 hours a day, but there are five places where by custom or precedent it is flown 24 hours a day: Over the Capitol in two places; over any fort or ship in battle; over Francis Scott Key's grave in Frederick, Md.; over the War Memorial at Worcester, Mass., and over Taos, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the day and any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Second, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR THE NORTH-WEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a communication sent to me by a group of constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from Hon. Harry Slattery, the R. E. A. Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZING INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the amendment is?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I shall be pleased to make an explanation.

The House committee reported a bill identical with this except for three words. These three words which differentiate the Senate bill from the House bill I propose to strike out by an amendment which I intend to offer.

The difference relates to this particular question: These departments are frequently required to exchange materials with other departments. Sometimes one department will have surplus materials it does not need, but which another department does, and it was originally provided in the bill that it should apply to all departments and agencies of the Government. The House committee struck out that general provision and limited it to apply to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We did not want trading going on among too many departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (a) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) Any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, if funds are available therefor and if it is determined by the head of such executive department, establishment, bureau, or office to be in the interest of the Government so to do, may place orders with any other such department, establishment, bureau, or office for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that such requisitioned Federal agency may be in a position to supply, equipped to render, or obtain by contract, and shall pay promptly by check to such Federal agency as may be requisitioned, upon its written request, either in advance or upon the furnishing or performance thereof, all or part of the estimated or actual cost thereof as determined by such department, establishment, bureau, or office as may be requisitioned; but proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the materials, supplies, or equipment furnished, or work or services performed, paid

for in advance, shall be made as may be agreed upon by the departments, establishments, bureaus, or offices concerned: *Provided*, That if such work or services can be as conveniently or more cheaply performed by private agencies, such work shall be let by competitive bids to such private agencies. Bills rendered, or requests for advance payments made, pursuant to any such order, shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: After line 23 insert: "*Provided*, That the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, and Civil Aeronautics Administration may place orders, as provided herein, for material, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that any requisitioned Federal agency may be in position to supply or to render or obtain by contract: *Provided further*,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 13, after the word "supply", strike out the comma and insert the word "or."

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "or obtain by contract."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to consider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, upon orders placed by the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, and Civil Aeronautics Administration."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a brief poem entitled "At Half Mast," by Mr. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of the regular business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COUNTY FAIRS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Defense Transportation, through the director, Mr. Eastman, has asked for the discontinuation, for the duration, of

county fairs and similar activities, which would include 4-H Club fairs and exhibits. This request was in order to preserve our supply of gasoline, rubber, and transportation facilities.

I take the floor today to protest against this request because there has been no protest from the Office of Defense Transportation regarding the continuance of professional racing and other sports which attract huge crowds. These crowds use untold amounts of gasoline, rubber, and a great amount of our transportation facilities. If Mr. Eastman wants our farm communities to stop our county fairs and our 4-H Club activities for the duration I am sure we will do that if it will help win the war—but the same treatment should be accorded to these places where horse racing is going on and other places which attract such tremendous crowds of people. Let there be no discrimination in our effort to win this war quickly. Our farming people will do what is asked of them but we want equality.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that the farmers are asked to raise the food which is to keep alive our Army, Navy, the armies and navies of our Allies, and also our civilian population. Our county fairs have concentrated on showing of the products of our farms. They bring together our farmers to discuss better ways and means of raising your food. Our county boards have made legal contracts with entertainment people for fairs already arranged. Our 4-H Club boys and girls have prepared for a year to show their livestock. These farm boys and girls should be given the opportunity to carry out this year's business to a conclusion. They have cared for their calves, hogs, and sheep in view of showing at county and State fairs this fall. If we must close these kind of fairs, in my opinion it should be done after the season is completed so that hundreds of show herds now prepared for exhibition can be shown. I make this suggestion to the membership of the House after some communications I have had with the farmers in my district who are as interested as all of us are in winning this war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK]?

There was no objection.

CLEVELAND'S DONATION OF A BOMBER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Cleveland was here yesterday, but he did not come with hat in hand or with his mitt sticking out, asking for Federal funds. Instead, he presented Secretary Morgenthau with a check for \$300,000 to purchase a bomber.

The campaign of the Cleveland News to purchase a bomber for MacArthur has been carried through to a sensational and brilliant conclusion. Cleveland factory workers, labor organizations, employers, rich and poor, men, women, and children, have poured more than \$300,000 into a victory fund, which shows America's determination and generosity.

Cleveland's bomber for MacArthur is a symbol of the real unity of our Nation. Without compulsion, without pressure, thousands of Clevelanders gave cheerfully and eagerly of their funds to send their token to Tokyo.

The Cleveland News and the people of Cleveland are to be congratulated upon this achievement. It should serve as a model for the entire Nation no less than as a direct answer to the dictators of the Axis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a communication, and also to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a Flag Day address at Valley Forge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed

to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, 47, and 48; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$528,798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$26,624,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,766,446"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,830,075"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$886,034"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to said amendment numbered 79.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 10 proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 10 proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 42, 43, 44, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY.

Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. McNARY.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and on certain House amendments thereto, to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Corrections of totals, etc.

The following amendments are in correction of totals, allocations, correction of the text, etc.: Nos. 21, 40, 41, 46, 47, and 48.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 19, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$778,798, instead of \$278,798 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to recommend \$528,798.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 38, national forest protection and management: Provides an increase of \$3,000,000 to strengthen forest fire control and an increase of \$20,000 for expansion of recreational facilities at Mount Charleston near Las Vegas, Nev. The conference report eliminates the latter item, of \$20,000, and provides an increase of \$1,500,000 for the forest-fire-control item.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$7,500,000, instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to recommend \$7,000,000.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 79: Provides that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply with the program shall be entitled to the same payments for such compliances as other producers. The House has voted to recede and concur in the amendment with an amendment providing that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by any State and who comply with the program shall also be entitled to such payments for such compliances. The House recedes from its amendment to this amendment and agrees to the original Senate amendment. This action is taken in view of advice from the Department that tenants and sharecroppers on croplands owned by States may now be paid for compliances referred to and that the language proposed to be added by the House is not needed.

Interchange of appropriations

Amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Authorizes interchange within bureaus of not to exceed 10 per centum, instead of not to exceed 5 per centum of the amounts appropriated as proposed by the House; and authorizes the addition of not more than 10 per centum to any one item, instead of not more than 5 per centum as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed with respect to each of these amendments that 7 per centum be substituted for 5 per centum and 10 per centum proposed by the House and by the Senate, respectively.

Amendments in disagreement

Amendments numbered 43, 44, and 93 relate to totals.

Amendment No. 42, forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates \$5,000,000, instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment fixing the amount at \$4,000,000.

Parity payments

Amendment No. 81: Provides that the agricultural conservation payments shall be taken into account and added to the farmer's market returns in determining the amount of the parity payment to which he may be entitled.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 83, relating to Government-controlled stocks of grain which may be sold for less than parity for feeding purposes or for manufacture of alcohol, etc.: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality and is sold for feeding purposes or the manufacture of alcohol"; while the Senate provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality or is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of" certain industrial alcohols, acetone, and rubber. The question of merit in the Senate amendment lies in its substitution of the word "or" for the word "and".

Amendment No. 85: The Senate proposes that not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat be sold for feeding purposes.

Amendment No. 86: The Senate proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 per centum of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 90, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,000,000, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91, loans: Authorizes \$40,000,000, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 95, rehabilitation services and assistance: Appropriates \$50,319,557, instead of \$25,319,557 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96, loans: Authorizes \$125,000,000, instead of \$70,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, land purchase program: Authorizes the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

• Mr. Speaker, this is the second conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. The subject matters which are included in the report are not numerous. I shall make brief reference to them and then undertake to answer any questions which may be propounded to me by Members of the House.

Some very substantial subject matters are still in disagreement and, of course, after consideration of the conference report it is expected that these will be taken up one by one and disposed of in accordance with the wishes of the House.

The conference report proposes to dispose of the difference between the two Houses with reference to the appropriations for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by accepting one-half of the increase which has been proposed by the Senate. You will recall that upon passage of the bill through the House, the House adopted an amendment which reduced the funds of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by \$1,000,000 below the amount which had been reported to the House by the committee, the committee having already reduced the amount \$50,000 below the Budget estimate.

The Senate upon consideration of this item in the bill increased the amount for that Bureau by one-half of the House cut; that is, by \$500,000. It is the proposal of the conference report to accept one-half of such increase, \$250,000, which will bring the amount of the bill as it provides for this Bureau to \$800,000 below the amount of the Budget estimate.

I feel that will be satisfactory to the most ardent advocates of economy, although there are some of us who feel that the amount of appropriation provided will be insufficient to provide for the adequate carrying on of the work of this very important Bureau and in the event that our fears should prove well founded, it is anticipated that appropriate request will be submitted by the Budget to the deficiency committee and will receive the consideration of that committee.

The second important item which has been in dispute, and which is proposed to be provided for by the conference report, is that relating to the appropriation for national forest management and fire protection. You will recall that the Senate increased the amount provided in the House bill by \$3,000,000 for the purpose of fire protection in our national forests. When the first conference report on this bill was before the House, upon motion submitted by myself as chairman of the House conferees the House by a vote of 174 to 171, a majority of only 3, decided to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. Since that time the Senate Committee on Appropriations has refused to make provision for the continuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Action to that effect had already been taken by the House. It is unquestionably true that the entire removal of the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps from our national forests will very greatly tend to increase the danger of fire and increase the necessity for the Government to make other provision for the protection of those forests in lieu of that protection which has heretofore been afforded by units of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Under these circumstances, the House conferees felt that the House would approve an agreement with the Senate to divide the amount which had been provided by the Senate increase. In other words, the conference report contemplates the addition of \$1,500,000 to these particular funds instead of the amount of \$3,000,000 as proposed in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

The conferees have also reached agreement insofar as they are authorized to do so with the Senate with reference to the item for cooperative fire protection; that is, with regard to the funds which are appropriated under the Clarke-McNary Act for cooperative fire-protection work with the several States. However, that amendment is legislative in character, as it exceeds the amount of the existing authorization and is not included in the conference report; but if and when the conference report is adopted, the conferees will submit a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment reducing the amount of

the Senate increase by \$1,000,000; that is, leaving the Senate increase over the House provision \$1,500,000 instead of \$2,500,000, as provided in the Senate bill.

There are some other amendments included in the conference report which relate to totals, and also an amendment relating to the interchange of funds between organizations within bureaus.

I think there is perhaps nothing else of such importance that I should undertake to discuss it at this time, unless some Member of the House desires to ask some question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I notice that the Senate has increased by \$1,000,000 the amount for forest roads and trails. I wonder if the Members of the House and of the committee of conference appreciate what is at stake in these forest roads and trails to open up the mineral resources so vitally needed by the Government for strategic purposes now in defense of our country.

Mr. TARVER. I regret that I overlooked making reference to that amendment. I think the fact that the Members of the House committee of conference do appreciate the very important nature of the problem which the gentleman has mentioned is indicated by the circumstance that we have agreed in this conference report, subject, of course, to the approval of the House, to increase the amount for forest roads and trails by \$500,000 beyond the Budget estimate. Surely the gentleman could ask no more.

Mr. WHITE. I am not asking any more, but I want to get across to the House and to the members of the committee of conference that this section, where all these minerals are, is strictly under the control of the Government and dependent on the Government for the construction of roads. There is no settlement there.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman is aware of the fact that as far as the construction of new roads to deposits of important strategic minerals is concerned, the Congress has made provision for the construction of such access roads in other legislation and by other appropriations. This provision is largely for the maintenance of existing forest roads and trails.

Mr. WHITE. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Forest Service has a big road-building organization staffed with engineers and equipment. Under the legislation about which the gentleman is talking there is no provision to use that force at all. The work must be done by the Bureau of Public Roads, and it must be done under another plan. It is so much more economical for the Forest Service to step in and build these roads with the organization and machinery on the ground rather than wait for a new outfit to come into a country with which it is not familiar and about which it knows little.

Mr. TABER. I have heard the gentleman express his opinion on this subject matter before. I think the con-

ferees have been very liberal in the handling of this particular problem.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PAGE. I notice that a number of what might be called important items in disagreement are still in disagreement. Do the conferees propose to move to recede and concur in those amendments or to insist on disagreement to the amendments?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that the conferees desire the instructions of the House. We are merely the servants of the House. It is very essential that action on this bill be completed by the 1st of July, otherwise no funds will be available for carrying on any of the activities of the Department of Agriculture during the next fiscal year. Therefore, in a spirit of seeking to know the wishes of the House certain motions will be offered with reference to the several amendments that are still in disagreement. We hope to have authoritative expression from the House relative to those subject matters. Of course, the House will control.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What has been done with Senate amendment No. 86?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will find a statement relative to all of these amendments in the conference report. I shall have to see what is in that amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Senate amendment proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. That amendment is in disagreement, may I say to the gentleman, and will come up later.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement showing the status of the bill at the present time; that is, the appropriations contained in the bill as it passed the House and as it passed the Senate, and the amount still in disagreement, together with a comparison with similar information as to the act for the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1943

	1942	As passed House	As agreed to, to date	Increase as agreed, over bill as passed House
Direct appropriations.....	\$1, 127, 623, 854	\$648, 170, 517	\$652, 761, 791	+\$4, 591, 274
Reappropriations.....	26, 209, 866	18, 384, 620	18, 384, 620	-----
Contractual authorization (on parity).....	-----	(?)	(?)	-----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authorizations (farm-tenant loans, Farm Security loans, and Rural Electrification Administration loans).....	270, 000, 000	105, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----
Permanent appropriations.....	104, 813, 084	139, 087, 795	139, 087, 795	-----
Trust funds.....	219, 636, 206	168, 026, 867	168, 026, 867	-----

¹ The total as passed the Senate is \$680,395,695.

² Authorization to make commitments up to full parity.

Amendments still in disagreement

	House	Senate	Senate increase above House
Direct appropriations:			
Farm Tenant Act.....	\$1, 250, 000	\$2, 000, 000	+\$750, 000
Farm Security Administration.....	25, 319, 557	50, 319, 557	+25, 000, 000
Total, direct appropriations.....	26, 569, 557	52, 319, 557	+25, 750, 000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authorizations:			
Farm Tenant Act.....	25, 000, 000	40, 000, 000	+15, 000, 000
Farm Security Administration.....	70, 000, 000	125, 000, 000	+55, 000, 000
Total, loans.....	95, 000, 000	165, 000, 000	+70, 000, 000

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and, having none, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.
The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Baldwin	Capozzoli	Ellis
Barry	Casey, Mass.	Fenton
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Fish
Beckworth	Cason	Fogarty
Blackney	Cluett	Forand
Bolton	Coffey, Nebr.	Ford, Leland M.
Boykin	Cole, Md.	Gale
Bradley, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Gavagan
Bradley, Pa.	Crosser	Gifford
Brown, Ohio	Cullen	Gilchrist
Buck	Davis, Ohio	Green
Buckler, Minn.	Delaney	Haines
Buckley, N. Y.	Dickstein	Hall
Burch	Dies	Edwin Arthur
Burdick	Douglas	Harness
Byrne	Drewry	Harrington
Byron	Duncan	Hart

Harter	Mitchell	Scott
Heffernan	Murray	Secrest
Hess	Myers, Pa.	Shannon
Hoffman	O'Day	Sheridan
Hook	O'Leary	Short
Izac	Osmer	Sikes
Jarrett	O'Toole	Smith, Pa.
Johnson, Ind.	Pfeifer	Smith, Wash.
Johnson,	Joseph L.	Smith, N. Va.
Lyndon B.	Plauché	Somers, N. Y.
Kee	Ploeser	Starnes, Ala.
Kelley, Pa.	Powers	Sutphin
Kennedy,	Randolph	Sweeney
Martin J.	Rankin, Mont.	Thomas, N. J.
Kennedy,	Reece, Tenn.	Tinkham
Michael J.	Reed, Ill.	Tolan
Keogh	Robertson,	Traynor
Klein	N. Dak.	Vincent, Ky.
Kocialkowski	Robison, Ky.	Vreeland
Landis	Rockefeller	Walter
Larrabee	Rogers, Okla.	Weaver
Lea	Romjue	Weiss
Lynch	Sacks	Wene
McGehee	Sasser	Whelchel
Maas	Satterfield	Wilson
Maclejewski	Scanlon	Wolverton, N. J.
Marcantonio	Schaefer, Ill.	Worley
Merritt	Schuetz	Youngdahl
Mills Ark.	Schulte	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Three hundred and one Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk report the first amendment in disagreement and I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 42, 43, and 44 be considered together, since amendment No. 43 and amendment No. 44 merely relate to totals and therefore will be determined by the action taken on amendment No. 42.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 42: Page 47, line 18, strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Amendment No. 43: Page 47, line 19, strike out "\$68,800" and insert "\$74,830."

Amendment No. 44: Page 48, line 3, strike out "\$17,175,635" and insert "\$22,704,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain motions with reference to the three amendments read, which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$4,000,000."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$72,418."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$20,184,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me observe that the conferees are in entire agreement on the three amendments that the gentleman now proposes to discuss. They em-

brace only some additional funds for forest-fire cooperation on which we are agreed due to the action of the House and the Senate on the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. TARVER. Yes, I undertook to explain to the House in connection with the consideration of the conference report that the conferees have agreed upon this item with the Senate, and that the reason it was not included in the conference report was simply on account of the fact that it is legislative in character since it exceeds the amount of the authorization contained in the Clarke-McNary Act for forest-fire cooperative work. I think unless there is some misunderstanding on the part of someone, personally, as to what the amendment provides or some desire to understand it more clearly, I shall not undertake to consume further time.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like a little more detailed information, as it is a matter of very great interest to me, on the \$3,000,000 increased item and the increase of \$1,500,000 for forest control. I would appreciate if the gentleman would explain to the House just what the difference is between the House and the Senate conferees on these two items.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently was not present when I discussed that matter in the consideration of the conference report. The conference report contains an agreement for one-half of the Senate increase. That is, the amount for the national forest-fire protection work is increased by one and one-half million dollars, instead of by \$3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. This agreement increases the amount for forest fire cooperative work beyond the \$2,500,000 carried in the House bill by \$1,500,000, making the total amount available, if this motion is adopted, for forest fire cooperative work with the States, \$4,000,000 instead of the amount which was available for the present fiscal year of \$2,500,000.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman whether the conferees have agreed on that item, or is that item still in disagreement?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself in a colloquy just a moment ago indicated to the House that we are in entire agreement and that the Senate has already agreed to the motion as proposed by myself in behalf of the conferees. If this motion is adopted, it will end the matter so far as that item is concerned.

Mr. MOTT. There is no disagreement between the House and the Senate.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. MOTT. On the forest-fire control item.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

PROTECTION FROM FOREST FIRES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take just a moment to compliment the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this agricultural appropriation bill for their provision of an appropriation to protect our great forests from destruction by fire. The necessity for

this protection was never greater in our entire history than it is today.

California has a dry season, which sometimes is almost a drought, from April to October, and during this period some of the finest forests in the world are subject to these forest fires. Their importance cannot be overstated. The boys of our C. C. C. camps built splendid firebreaks, through these forests, but they are a thing of the past and the protection which they gave must now be furnished by the other agencies of the Government.

Those forests along the Pacific coast and adjacent thereto are primarily redwoods and pines. The great California redwoods are not only the largest living things on this earth but they are also the oldest. They were already great trees when Moses was found by Pharaoh's daughter among the bullrushes.

Forest fires on our coast range have been known to form a blanket of smoke out over the Pacific for scores of miles, forming a perfect smoke screen which sometimes lasts for days over wide areas of the coast.

The annual loss in the United States from forest fires averages between thirty-five and forty million dollars—a loss which can be substantially reduced by adequate protection.

We have sadly neglected our forests in America while other nations, particularly in Europe, have taken great care of theirs. The once great forests that stretched across the country have been devastated and in many places ruined. When they are gone they are gone forever. The only real forests we have left for the future generations are along the Pacific coast and in the Intermountain States. If incendiary bombs should be dropped among them to start forest fires, there are some great centers of population which would be cut off from all escape. We must take adequate steps to forego such a catastrophe.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: After line 14, insert "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 81, and on that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask the House to have a roll-call vote with reference to the adoption or not of the motion which I have just submitted in behalf of the House conferees. The language of the Senate amendment to which we are asking that you disagree, would include within the farmer's market price for his product, in determining whether or not

he may be entitled to parity benefits, the amount of soil-conservation benefits earned by him in the soil-conservation and domestic allotment program. The matter has been thoroughly discussed several times on the floor of the House in connection with the pending bill and it would, in my judgment, avail nothing for me to undertake to cover the subject matter again.

It would be useless to review the various arguments that have been submitted against the inclusion of this language in the language of the appropriation bill relating to parity payments. Suffice it to say that the Congress in the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, in making provision for parity payments to the producers of five basic agricultural commodities, made no such provision as is here proposed by the Senate amendment, and the language inserted by the Senate first made its appearance in the agricultural appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. It was agreed to by the House conferees and by the House last year upon the understanding upon the part of at least a part of the membership of the House conference committee that the agreement related to parity payments as provided for in the bill for the present fiscal year only. There appears to our mind, and I think that in saying this I speak for every member of the House conference committee, for the three Republican as well as the five Democratic members—and if any one of them disagrees with what I say, now would be an appropriate time and place for him to say so—I believe that I speak for all of the members of the conference committee when I say that I can conceive of no justification whatever for charging the farmer with these soil-conservation benefits earned by him, and in connection with the earning of which he incurred considerable expenditure, for labor, materials, fertilizer, and for seed, in determining the amount that he receives for the particular basic agricultural product, which he produces.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that I entirely agree with the motion that he offers now, and I believe that we ought to have a record vote on that motion to indicate to the Senate conferees how the House feels about it.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman for that statement. I will say this in conclusion: I do not propose to consume further time of the House. If the basis for making parity payments should be changed so as to provide for the inclusion of these soil-conservation benefits in determining market price of the farmers' products, that change ought not to be effected from year to year in an appropriation bill, but it ought to be effected through the passage of legislation reported from the appropriate legislative committee. It is a matter for legislative consideration and not for consideration in connection with this annual supply bill.

Mr. PIERCE. Does this amendment affect the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Mr. TARVER. This does not involve that subject matter, which will be gone into in a later part of the bill.

Unless there are some further questions and unless somebody desires to speak on this subject matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 244, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—244

Allen, Ill.	Ford, Miss.	Meyer, Md.
Allen, La.	Ford, Thomas F.	Michener
Andersen,	Fulmer	Mills, La.
H. Carl	Gale	Monroney
Anderson,	Gathings	Moser
N. Mex.	Gehrmann	Mott
Andersen,	Gibson	Mundt
August H.	Gillette	Murdoch
Angell	Gillie	Nelson
Arends	Gore	Nichols
Arnold	Gossett	O'Connor
Barden	Graham	O'Hara
Barnes	Granger	O'Neal
Baumhart	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Beam	Grant, Ind.	Face
Beiter	Gregory	Patman
Bell	Guyer	Patton
Bender	Gwynne	Pearson
Bennett	Halleck	Peterson, Fla.
Bishop	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Bland	Harris, Ark.	Pierce
Bloom	Harris, Va.	Pittenger
Boehne	Healey	Plumley
Boggs	Hébert	Poage
Bonner	Heidinger	Priest
Boren	Hill, Colo.	Ramsay
Brooks	Hinshaw	Ramspeck
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Rankin, Miss.
Bryson	Holbrook	Rankin, Mont.
Bulwinkle	Holland	Rees, Kans.
Burgin	Hope	Richards
Butler	Houston	Rivers
Byron	Howell	Rizley
Cannon, Mo.	Hull	Robertson, Va.
Carlson	Hunter	Robinson, Utah
Cartwright	Imhoff	Rockwell
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Chenoweth	Jacobson	Rolph
Chilperfield	Jarman	Russell
Clark	Jennings	Sanders
Claypool	Jensen	Sasscer
Clevenger	Johns	Sauthoff
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Ill.	Shafer, Mich.
Collins	Johnson,	Shanley
Colmer	Luther A.	Sheppard
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Va.
Cocper	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Wis.
Copeland	Jonkman	Snyder
Courtney	Keefe	South
Cox	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cravens	Kelly, Ill.	Spence
Crawford	Kerr	Springer
Culkin	Kilday	Steagall
Cunningham	Kinzer	Stefan
Curtis	Kirwan	Stevenson
D'Alesandro	Kleberg	Stratton
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Sullivan
Day	Kopplemann	Sumner, Ill.
Dewey	Kramer	Sumners, Tex.
Dirksen	Kunkel	Sutphin
Disney	Lambertson	Talbot
Domengeaux	Lane	Talle
Dondero	Lanham	Tarver
Doughton	Lea	Terry
Downs	Leavy	Thom
Duncan	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	Ludlow	Thomason
Dworshak	McGregor	Tibbott
Eberharter	McIntyre	Van Zandt
Edmiston	McKeough	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott, Calif.	McLaughlin	Voorhis, Calif.
Engel	McMillan	Wadsworth
Englebright	Maciora	Ward
Fitzgerald	Mahon	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Manasco	West
Flaherty	Mansfield	Wheat
Flannagan	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Folger	Mason	Whittington
	May	Wickersham

Williams	Woodruff, Mich.	Youngdahl
Winter	Wright	Zimmerman
Wolcott	Young	

NAYS—49

Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Paddock
Andrews	Hoffman	Pfeiffer
Bates, Mass.	Holmes	William T.
Canfield	Jenks, N. H.	Rabaut
Crowther	Jones	Reed, N. Y.
Dingell	Kean	Rich
Ditter	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Lesinski	Simpson
Eliot, Mass.	Lewis	Smith, Maine
E'ston	McCormack	Stearns, N. H.
Faddis	McLean	Taber
Fellows	Magnuson	Thill
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Treadway
Gerlach	Miller	Vorvys, Ohio
Hall	Norton	Wasielewski
Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Hancock	Oliver	Wolfenden, Pa.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith, Ohio

NOT VOTING—138

Baldwin	Haines	Plauché
Barry	Hall	Ploeser
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	Powers
Beckworth	Harness	Randolph
Blackney	Harrington	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Harter	Robertson,
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Robson, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Rockefeller
Buck	Hill, Wash.	Rogers, Okla.
Buckler, Minn.	Hook	Romjue
Buckley, N. Y.	Izac	Sabath
Burch	Jarrett	Sacks
Burdick	Jenkins, Ohio	Satterfield
Byrne	Johnson, Ind.	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson,	Schaefer, Ill.
Capozzoli	Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Carter	Kee	Schulte
Casey, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Scott
Celler	Kennedy	Secrest
Chapman	Martin J.	Shannon
Clason	Kennedy	Sheridan
Cluett	Michael J.	Short
Coffee, Nebr.	Keogh	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Klein	Smith, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kociakowski	Smith, Wash.
Costello	Landis	Smith, W. Va.
Creal	Larrabee	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Cullen	McGehee	Sweeney
Davis, Ohio	McGranery	Tenerowicz
Delaney	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	Maciejewski	Tinkham
Dies	Marcantonio	Tolan
Douglas	Merritt	Traynor
Drewry	Mills, Ark.	Vincent, Ky.
Ellis	Mitchell	Vreeland
Fenton	Murray	Walter
Fish	Myers, Pa.	Weaver
Fogarty	Norrell	Weiss
Forand	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wene
Ford, Leland M.	O'Day	Wheelchel
Gavagan	O'Leary	White
Gearhart	Osmer	Wilson
Gifford	Patrick	Wolverton, N. J.
Gilchrist	Pfeifer	Woodrum, Va.
Green	Joseph L.	Worley

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Blackney.
 Mr. Ellis with Mr. Ploeser.
 Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Landis.
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Harness.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Gilchrist.
 Mr. Plauché with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Powers.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Baldwin.
 Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Clason.
 Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Gearhart.
 Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Secrest with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
 Mr. Creal with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Cluett.
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Tinkham.
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Norrell with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Haines with Mr. Osmer.
 Mr. McGehee with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Wilson.
 Mr. Buck with Mr. Rockefeller.
 Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Jarrett.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Vreeland.
 Mr. Crosser with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
 Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
 Mr. Harter with Mr. Marcantonio.
 Mr. Cullen with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
 Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hefernan.
 Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Romjue.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Klein.
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Larrabee.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Cole of Maryland.
 Mr. Lynch with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Merritt.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. O'Day.
 Mr. Sacks with Mr. Byrne.
 Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Hook.
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Sheridan.
 Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Davis of Ohio.
 Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. McGranery.
 Mr. Tenerowicz with Mr. Forand.
 Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Traynor.
 Mr. Weiss with Mr. Wene.
 Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. White.
 Mr. Worley with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Harrington.
 Mr. Patrick with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Schulte with Mr. Mitchell.
 Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 83, 85, and 86 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am disposed to object to the request, but I reserve the right to object to state the situation and ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] a question.

The first amendment, amendment No. 83, is the "and or" amendment. As I understand, the effect of that is to require that before grain is sold below parity, if the House language is insisted upon, sale of the grain must be in two conditions. First, that it shall have deteriorated, and second, that it shall be sold for the purpose of feed or the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. TARVER. That is a fact.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senate proposal is to use the word "or" instead of the word "and," so that the grain could be sold below parity either if it had deteriorated, or if it were used for feed or the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. TARVER. No; I think the gentleman is laboring under a mistaken impression there. If the word "or" is substituted it can be sold for the purpose of feeding, whether it is deteriorated or not, and for the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is stating exactly what I tried to state.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the House should recede on that point and the Senate language is accepted, by the use of the word "or" instead of the word "and," then the grain may be sold below parity if it meets one of the two conditions. That is, either if it had deteriorated or if it were to be sold for feed or the manufacture of alcohol. Therein lies the danger which alarms the people who are interested in farm prices. That is, that there is no limit to that, and especially taken in connection with Amendment No. 86 it would mean that if the grain were sold for the purpose of manufacturing alcohol it could be sold at any point below parity. Amendment No. 86 gives protection to 85 percent of the corn price only if it is sold for the purpose of feed.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that the conferees are in accord with regard to the question of the subject matters of these three amendments being substantially identical. That is, only one problem is involved. If the gentleman insists on objecting, of course, we would have to take them up separately and consume a great deal more time in discussion than would otherwise be true. But when the bill was last before the House we considered them together. The Senate on yesterday considered them together, and I can conceive of no reason for the separation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I realize the desirability of saving time in the consideration of the matter, but if the House insists upon its position with respect to the first amendment, then the other amendments become more or less immaterial. If the House should accept the first amendment, then it might want to insist on the other two or it might not. I merely wish to keep the door open and shall not debate the matter.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman may offer motions to recede and concur, with or without amendments, with regard to either of the three amendments separately, and no right on his part would be jeopardized simply by agreeing to consider the three amendments together.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that, except that I think the situation as to the importance of a vote on the next two amendments will be materially different if the House insists on adherence to the use of the word "and" instead of the word "or."

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman means that there would be perhaps

three roll calls and 3 hours of debate instead of 1 hour of debate and one roll call. If the gentleman desires to object, of course, that is his privilege.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.
 Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's position is that the next amendment in disagreement has different aspects than the following two amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Exactly. If the House insists on its position on the first amendment, then the second amendment becomes relatively immaterial. The vote could be different on the second and third amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see the gentleman's position, but as I understand the gentleman's position, he is not contending that there could not be a vote on both 84 and 86 together?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the gentleman is not insisting on three separate votes. The gentleman's contemplated position is not three separate votes, but he feels that this one has different elements involved than both 85 and 86?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct; yes.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 81, line 13, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Would it be in order to move to consider amendments 83, 85, and 86 together?

The SPEAKER. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. TARVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 83.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

There is, I think, only one substantial motion involved in these three amendments. The action which may be taken in the House in connection with amendment numbered 83 should in my judgment be decisive of the action with regard to amendments numbered 85 and 86. We intend to ask that we may have a roll call on amendment numbered 83. I think that is vital to further consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill. The Senate has the right in my judgment to expect the House to go on record with reference to the proposal here involved. The Senate has had two record votes on the language which it has inserted in this proviso.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.
 The Senate had its last record vote on yesterday, and by a vote of 46 to 13 insisted upon the retention of the lan-

guage contained in these three amendments.

I have no interest in these three amendments except as it may lie within my humble ability to point out the facts to the Representatives from those areas of the country which are directly concerned with the market prices of wheat and corn. The area which I represent is not so concerned except that it does not produce enough of these commodities for the use of its own people and is therefore a purchasing area so far as commercial wheat and corn are concerned rather than a producing area. I do not believe the question of fair prices for agricultural commodities may be subdivided into sections or areas, or that the interests of one type of producers may be considered separately and apart from the others, and although cotton is not here involved in the consideration of these amendments, I intend so long as I can to stand by the Representatives from the wheat- and corn-producing areas of the country in insisting that the Government shall not use the stocks of grains, corn and wheat, which it has accumulated to manipulate the prices of these commodities in the markets of the country and to depress the prices of these commodities in order to keep down, as is the announced purpose, the cost of living to the people of the country who are not engaged in agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. In just a few minutes, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

We are spending \$202,000,000,000 plus in the war program appropriated during these 3 fiscal years. A great deal of this money unfortunately is probably being wasted. I say this without attributing any improper conduct to any particular administrative official, but I think this statement is undoubtedly true. Down here in southwest Washington at this time they are building an underpass. One of the foremen told me 2 or 3 days ago that he handed out checks to the Negro laborers who were employed there and that each week they each make from \$80 to \$103. In some instances he hands out checks of \$103 to individual laborers for 1 week's work at common or ordinary labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Down in my own little city in Georgia I know of a number of cases which may be illustrated by one which came closely under my personal observation where a man who had never made more than \$3 a day in his life went to Tullahoma, Tenn., to Government work and came back a few days afterward waving a check for \$29.75 for 2 days' work. Instances of this kind may be multiplied by the hundreds of thousands throughout this country.

If I vote to have the Government sell farm products for less than parity I must go back to my farmers and say to them that I voted to impose this sacrifice upon them at a time when they might other-

wise have secured parity and other farmers throughout the country might have secured parity; that I did it in order to keep down the cost of living for these individuals who are already receiving insofar as they are engaged in defense industry, incomes largely in excess of any they ever received before in their lives. Labor as a whole in the United States is, according to evidence delivered before our subcommittee, receiving 379 percent of the average which it received in the period from 1909 to 1914, the period which is adopted as the base for the determination of what constitutes parity for the five major agricultural commodities. I am not willing so far as I am concerned to vote to have the Government undertake to destroy the hope that parity might be at this time achieved in the program which it has carried on for several years with that objective in view.

Mr. HOPE rose.

Mr. TARVER. Let me say this further, then I will yield: This is not a question which affects my area but principally every grain-growing and corn-producing area of the United States.

I have offered this motion to insist on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment. If you feel that the interests of your people require that you should vote to agree to the Senate amendments or that you should agree to those amendments with modifications, I certainly will be pleased to yield to you to offer such a motion as a substitute for the one which I have submitted as you may desire to offer. But let us try to settle this matter here today once and for all. Let us call the roll, let us stand up and be counted, and if a majority of this House is willing to let the Government sell grain which has not deteriorated for feed purposes or to sell it for other purposes for which it would otherwise have to be obtained from grain dealers in the open market, at less than parity, then do so by your vote and the conferees, of course, will be relieved of this burden in the further consideration of this bill. But if you do not believe that ought to be permitted, then go on record to that effect, and let us continue in an endeavor to arrive at a conclusion with the Senate prior to the 1st of July when this bill should become effective.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is no limit in this bill below the 85-percent parity at which the Government can sell this wheat?

Mr. TARVER. At not less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of corn. But it can sell for less than 85 percent of parity; is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. I do not so understand it. I understand the limitation to be as to the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat that it may not be sold at less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. As the gentleman knows, I have favored the Senate amendment and I still favor it, but I am willing to send the bill back to conference if the gentleman feels that the conferees have a reasonably good chance to get together.

Mr. TARVER. I do not think the conferees can settle this question. We have been engaged in an effort to settle it for several weeks, as the gentleman knows. We cannot reach an agreement with the Senate. If the gentleman feels that this amendment of the Senate ought to be adopted, either in the form which the Senate approved it or in modified form, he ought to offer a motion, fight for it, and see if the House will adopt his amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps first we should take an inventory. The latest figures available to me as to the amount of corn and wheat, both in storage, owned by the Federal Government, as of April 24, 1942, and under loan are about as follows: We own 70,000,000 bushels of corn and we have under loan 260,000,000 bushels of corn, making a total of 330,000,000 bushels. We own outright from the 1940 wheat crop 110,000,000 bushels. We have under loan of the 1941 crop 332,000,000 bushels, and we anticipate under loan of the present crop 350,000,000 bushels, making a total of 792,000,000 bushels of wheat and 330,000,000 bushels of corn that will be available and that will be at the disposition of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of the paragraph which we are now discussing.

Let us see what they propose to do with this grain. When this bill was before the House we said: "You cannot sell it below parity." We said also, "We will make two conditions. You can sell it below parity if you sell it for relief." We said also that "You can sell it below parity if it is deteriorated and you can sell it for feed or you sell it for the manufacture of alcohol." We also said, "You can sell it below parity if you sell it for seed." That is where we stopped.

Here is all this grain at the disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it must be sold at parity except if substantially deteriorated it may be sold for feed or alcohol. Outside of that it must be sold for parity.

The bill went to the Senate. What did they say? They concurred in what we said in part. They said, "You can sell it for relief below parity." They said, "You can sell it if it is substantially deteriorated," and at that point they struck out the word "and" and inserted the word "or" which is the amendment before us. What does that little transformation of two conjunctions do? Here is what it does. They can sell grain, and that means corn and wheat for feed in any amount except for that little proviso that we will get to directly. They can sell any amount of corn and wheat for the manufacture of ethyl alcohol and butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber at any price. There is no limit. Do you think there is a limit? Mr. Hudson, of

the Commodity Credit Corporation, in a memorandum to the Appropriations Committee which was inserted in the bill appropriating \$42,000,000 for the Military Establishment, indicated that they actually sold some of that grain for 24 cents a bushel. That is what they can do. With the exception of grain for feed they can sell this entire store of grain for any price.

They go further. They said, "You can sell it below parity for seed." Then they tacked on two limitations, namely, the other two amendments that will be considered directly. They said, "You cannot sell over 125,000,000 bushels for feed." It says nothing about wheat for breakfast food or for milling or for a thousand and one other purposes, but just for feed. That is the only limit.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. This amendment has nothing to do with the one hundred and twenty-five million that comes up later?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Those are two qualifying amendments, but the vital part of it is what we are considering now. In addition to the limit of 125,000,000 bushels for feed, they said: No grain for feed to be sold for less than 85 percent of corn parity.

The market on wheat today is \$1.30 per bushel. The market on corn today is about \$1 per bushel. Take wheat, which ought to bring \$1.30 and sell it for 85 percent of corn parity, and it means that \$1.30 wheat will be sold for 85 cents, if for feed. That, in a nutshell, is what the qualifying proviso will do.

That is what they are doing, that is what they have been doing, and that is what Mr. Hudson testified before the Senate committee, as you will find on page 259 of the Senate hearings.

There is no doubt as to what the facts are. Here are about 1,100,000,000 bushels of corn and wheat of which they can dispose. They will dump 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed, and your market is going down. Then what? You know what is going to happen to the price of corn, you know what is going to happen to the price of wheat. You know that if they make 575,000,000 gallons of alcohol to dehydrate powder, which they propose to do, they can give it away if they like unless this language is put in the bill. Every bushel dumped into the market at a price below parity will displace grain which the farmer now holds and so affects the price.

I say to you farmers from Nebraska and Kansas that you have as much of a stake in this today as we have out in the Corn Belt, because your market will go to pot along with ours; make no mistake about that.

They want to do this for the feeders. How amazing. The May figure of the Department of Agriculture shows that beef was \$2.53 per hundred above parity in May of this year, yet it is proposed to take from the corn farmer and the wheat farmer whose grain is below parity today and in addition subsidize the feeder whose livestock is \$2.53 per hundred above parity today. Mutton is about parity, beef is about parity, hogs are about

parity. Are the feeders to be subsidized at the expense of the corn and the wheat farmer, whose grain is substantially below parity today? Corn is still 15 to 20 cents a bushel below parity. When we go along with this language of the Senate, we will take a loss of at least 23 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat that they sell. That is not my testimony; it is the testimony of Mr. Hudson, who is running the show down there.

You will finally break down the market from the parity level. In this bill we direct the Secretary of Agriculture to pay full parity for 1942. Break the market, let the price come down, and then what? You have to dip into the Federal Treasury and take larger and larger amounts in order to bring the farmer up to parity. Last year it was \$212,000,000. It may be \$500,000,000. When you bring that price down, having directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay parity, you are going to dip into the Federal Treasury and take public funds once more to make up the gap, and then every cent per bushel of break there is in the grain market, on corn and wheat, the cost to Uncle Sam and to the taxpayer will be infinitely greater. Why should this be done? Frankly, I cannot understand it.

They say it is for storage, that there is an acute storage problem. Perhaps there was. I noticed, however, this statement in a Washington paper yesterday morning:

Grain storage crisis averted, so trade believes.

That was an Associated Press dispatch dated at Chicago June 20. They are meeting that storage situation a little at a time. But I say to you very frankly today that this certainly is no time to take a chance on breaking the grain market of the country, at a time when the costs of the farmers are going up.

What does the Department of Agriculture say about it? They say in the May issue of the Agricultural Situation that more people were hired on farms and higher prices were paid for farm labor than at any time in the last 12 years. As farm costs advance, is it fair to imperil the price and reduce the wage?

The Farm Bureau is against this. The National Grange is against it. Oddly enough, the American Live Stock Association, representing 85,000 feeders, speaking through Mr. E. W. Sheets, who testified before the Senate committee, is against it.

If they say it is required for feed, I direct your attention to page 5 of the Agricultural Situation, issued by the Department of Agriculture for May, in which they say this:

The output of high-protein feeds will be considerably larger, about 15 percent larger, than in 1942-43.

That same bulletin, issued in May by the Department of Agriculture, states:

The hog supply will be 15 percent larger than last year.

If they say it is needed for other meat and milk, this is what their own bulletin says:

Farmers this spring have been breaking all former records in the production of meats, milk, and eggs.

There has been nothing persuasive brought to the attention of our committee or the committee of conference to indicate why we should recede from our position, so I say to you today that the motion now pending, to further insist upon our disagreement to the Senate amendment and to send this back to conference on a ye-a-and-nay vote, should be decisively upheld by this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this item restricting the sales of farm products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation has been under consideration since this bill was sent to the Senate by the House more than a month ago. It has narrowed down until the issue here involved does not impress me as being of great importance insofar as wheat farmers are concerned. The issue now merely relates to the method of obtaining parity prices for wheat farmers.

I am sure that everyone will agree that this controversy in no way involves either cotton farmers or tobacco farmers. Since cotton and tobacco are the two principal money crops grown in my district, I think that I am in a position to discuss this matter impartially and without any degree of selfishness. While the farmers of my district are not very materially affected by the provision, I am, notwithstanding, most naturally interested in the welfare of all the farmers who might be affected. It appears to me that this is a fight between wheat growers and corn growers. It is entirely possible that the provisions inserted by the House committee and approved by the House would result in slightly higher market prices for some commodity than would be obtained by the amendment inserted in the Senate, which I understand is agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the President of the United States. However, any differences in the prices on the market would be made up by payments to the farmers so that the total to the producers of these commodities would not differ under the two proposals.

The Senate proposal would allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue to sell its surplus stocks in essentially the same manner as sales have been made in recent months. No sales of cotton or wheat have been made below parity in recent months. Sales of wheat and corn have been made at about 80 percent of parity in order to encourage the production of livestock. However, since more than 90 percent of all the corn produced is used in feeding livestock, the total income of farmers is not affected by the price at which corn is sold.

In recent months tobacco, wool, beef cattle, hogs, and most dairy products have averaged above parity. Since last December the combined average price of farm commodities has been near the parity level. In addition, farmers have received conservation and parity payments. The Secretary of Agriculture and those associated with him believe that it will not be possible to get the livestock production needed in the war effort if prices

of feed crops are substantially advanced. Many Members of this House from the wheat-producing areas believe that the House provisions would work to their disadvantage in that they would tend to restrict the use of wheat for feed and cause wheat stocks to accumulate until there would be no storage space available for succeeding crops of wheat. I am advised that wheat storage facilities are now greatly burdened. I understand that we have a full year's supply of wheat on hand and that storage facilities on farms are filled to overflowing and elevators throughout the country are likewise filled, and I have been told that much wheat now in storage is not adequately protected. I discussed this situation this morning with Governor Townsend, the present Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and with Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I was advised that in an effort to relieve the situation the Commodity Credit Corporation has obtained prefabricated bins sufficient to store 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and that these bins have been made available to farmers. I was also advised that the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations has recently obtained a priority order for 125 carloads of nails, which have been made available to farmers in the construction of additional storage facilities.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has said to the House that he is willing to abide by the judgment of the wheat growers of the country. I see here in front of me my distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, who represents one of the great wheat-growing areas of the country, and the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and many other Members from wheat-growing areas, most of whom I believe are in favor of the Senate amendment. I think that this problem should be regarded as national in its scope, rather than confined to any particular section. Yet, at the same time, I have a very profound respect for the views of Governor PIERCE, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and other gentlemen from wheat-producing areas, and I believe that they are right in the position they have taken in favor of the Senate amendment. I understand that wheat is now selling for 80 percent of parity, whereas the loan provides a floor of 85 percent of parity. The law requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans at 85 percent of parity to wheat producers also provides that it shall not be required to make loans unless the wheat is safely stored and protected. As I see it, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President, by insisting upon being permitted to sell wheat below parity for feed purposes are merely trying to convert a surplus commodity—that is, wheat—into livestock, so that a meat shortage might be prevented. I am sure that none of us want to see the time when meat will be rationed, and it appears entirely possible if feed prices are advanced too high, livestock production would not be sufficient to take care

of lend-lease shipments and our own needs without some form of rationing. Notwithstanding the present controversy, the administration can under existing law and authority lend or lease at a price less than parity, or for that matter, without any price being fixed at all, all of the stocks now on hand. In other words all of the grain now in storage and controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation could be given to England or to Russia or to our other Allies, but by the position taken by the House the same grain could not be sold to the producers of livestock in this country at less than parity price, even though an increase in the production of livestock is now admittedly essential in the war effort. The effect of the Senate amendment is to permit the Government to acquire wheat from farmers at parity prices and to sell the wheat to the producers of livestock at a price somewhat less than parity, to the end that livestock producers might be induced to produce the meat requirements of the war program.

I, of course, do not know what the President will do, but I predict that if the House insists upon disagreeing to the Senate amendment, this bill will be vetoed and the news will then go out to the country that the President has vetoed a bill providing parity payments to farmers. This, of course, is entirely erroneous. Those who are opposing the Senate amendment are today trying to lead the House to believe that the principle of parity is involved in this controversy. It is not here involved. I am for parity for the farmers; always have been and always shall be, but the result of the action taken on this amendment might be to actually prevent farmers being eligible for even the 85-percent parity loan which has heretofore been provided. Unless some of the wheat now in storage is disposed of and storage facilities are made available for the new crop, farmers will not in all probability be able to meet the storage requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to be eligible for loans. I do not believe that this agency of the Government should have its hands tied, especially when the Commodity Credit Corporation is trying to meet the needs of the crisis which we are now facing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not just now. I only have a few minutes.

I cannot see the logic of the arguments which have been made in opposition to the Senate amendment. The sale of wheat below parity is necessary because of a lack of storage facilities and because much of the wheat now in storage is deteriorating, and further because we need to encourage the production of beef and pork with which to feed the fighting forces of our Nation and the fighting forces of our Allies.

If wheat cannot now be sold in the market place for more than 80 percent of parity, it certainly appears that the wheat now being harvested will find its way into Government loans if proper storage facilities can be provided, and it, therefore, naturally follows that the new crop will be added to the crop now in

storage, and we will have a tremendous surplus of wheat accumulating which will reflect itself as a great burden upon the market, and it appears that if this procedure is followed, we are leading right into another Farm Board catastrophe, and at a time when we can ill afford to permit such a situation to occur.

Out of the discussion of Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies has emerged the belief on the part of some that this agency of the Government is going out of its way to hold down farm prices; that if the prices for corn and wheat were left to themselves they would rise to parity and above. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the Federal programs for wheat and corn, the price for both commodities not only would be below parity, but they probably would be far below 85 percent of parity. The reasons for this are evident when we look at the supply of corn, wheat, and other feeds. The supply of corn and other feed is at record high levels and we will have a carry-over of wheat on July 1, 1942, of about 630,000,000 bushels, another record. There is so much more wheat on hand than is needed for domestic consumption and export that wheat, were it not for Federal programs, would be used for feed in such quantities that the price for all grains would be far below present levels.

We have stored up stocks of feed, thus protecting farm prices and income, on the theory that the grain would be available for use in time of emergency. This is the essential idea of the ever-normal granary. If we ever had an emergency, we have one now. We should be free to use our feed in the manner which will best help win this war. I do not see how we can defend any proposal which will tie our hands and prevent us from using our resources to the fullest extent in this grave, grave period in our history.

This matter has now been before us for more than a month. The leaders in the Senate and the executive branch of the Government have agreed upon the proposition. The Senate seems unwilling to accept the proposal of the House and in the light of all of the circumstances I believe that in the long run it will be to the interest of farmers for us to accept the Senate's proposal and thus end the many uncertainties that will continue to exist in the minds of farmers and the country generally until this matter is disposed of. I, therefore, urge you to accept the Senate amendment and end the controversy.

There is a bill pending before the House Committee on Agriculture which provides for 100-percent parity loans on agricultural commodities. The chairman of the committee has been authorized to conduct hearings and to invite the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and the Price Administrator to appear before the committee for the purpose of discussing this very controversial subject. It is an important matter and should be given careful consideration by a legislative committee. Those of you who are interested in obtaining parity loans should give consideration to

the bill now pending, for that, and not this, is the way to obtain parity prices for farmers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the position taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on this amendment, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Georgia may prevail and that the conferees may be instructed to insist upon their disagreement.

My chief purpose, however, in asking for this brief time is to revert, with the permission of the House, to amendment No. 42, which we have just adopted. That is the amendment which provides an addition of \$4,000,000 for forest-fire protection. I want to congratulate the chairman and the House conferees for at least partially receding from the position they took on the matter of forest-fire protection at the time the subject was originally in the House. You may recall that at that time a number of us from the Pacific coast, including myself, made a new point in behalf of an increased appropriation for forest-fire protection because, as we contended, there was added danger to the west coast forests on account of the probable bombing and bombardment of the Pacific Northwest, which, under certain conditions, might destroy the forests.

You are aware, of course, that a few days ago the Oregon coast was bombarded by a Japanese submarine. Many, no doubt, wondered why the Jap submarine took the trouble to do that. The fact is that at least a part of the reason for that bombardment was to set the Coast Range forests on fire. The submarine dropped nine shells on the beach, and the forests in that area come right down to the beach. It happened at the time to be wet weather. Had it been in our dry season, which begins next month, the probability is that one or more of those nine shells might have started a very destructive forest fire. We need this additional money in order to protect against just such a repetition of this bombardment, or the possibility of a more effective bombardment by Japanese long-range bomber aircraft.

I was called from the Chamber just before the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] made his explanation in chief of this amendment. What I wanted to ask him when I interrogated him a few moments ago, was why the House conferees did not go the whole way and accept the \$5,000,000 Senate increase instead of the \$4,000,000 compromise. The parliamentary situation, of course, was such that nothing could be done about it, but I am very glad to have the additional \$4,000,000, and I wish to compliment and congratulate the chairman for this very liberal concession.

I do want to say this word of warning to the House, however: The chances are, on account of the situation which now obtains in the Aleutians, that until the Navy and the Army are able to take care

of that situation and bomb the Japs entirely out of that area—and I hope and have good reason to believe that will be only a short time—we may expect a repetition of what happened on the coast a few days ago, and we may expect it to be repeated as long as the Japs have a foothold at Kiska Island. For this reason, we may have to ask for additional money for forest-fire protection in a very short time; and if we do, I hope the House will grant it to us, so that if the forests are again endangered by enemy activity we may have the facilities to take care of the situation promptly and effectively.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I quote now what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said in the Senate yesterday:

Let me point out further, while I am on my feet, that under the provisions of the House bill the Government of the United States could not utilize 1 pound of the grain which is the property of the Government in the manufacture of synthetic rubber or in the manufacture of alcohol to produce high explosives to use in this war, unless it paid 100 percent of parity to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] very plainly said that we have to get this grain from the broker. We do not have to get it from the broker. We have it now. It belongs to the Government, is in its possession now, and it is the Government-owned grain only that we are going to use. I suggest in reference to protecting the price of corn that, if you will add, at the end of line 23, in amendment No. 86, the words "or at less than the prevailing price of corn in the locality where it is sold," you will protect the price of corn. I admit that relates to feeding only; there is a difference between feeding and manufacturing synthetic rubber and explosives for our soldiers to use. We had no idea when this legislation was first considered that we would ever want to use grain for alcohol to put into explosives, and we had no idea of using grain in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, but now we are at war, and we do need it for that purpose. Are you going to tell your Government that it cannot use that which it has and which it owns, for that purpose, to prosecute the war?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman half a minute more. I do this to correct the gentleman from Missouri. I said this grain, if not used for feeding purposes, would have to be procured by the Government from the broker through the grain dealers on the open market.

Mr. COCHRAN. I understand we have more in the hands of the Government now than we will need under the provisions of this proposal for alcohol and rubber.

Mr. TARVER. I simply corrected the quotation the gentleman undertook to quote from my remarks, and he inadvertently incorrectly did so.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the House amendment, there is no limitation on the amount of wheat the Government can sell at any price for alcohol or rubber purposes. So that point is out of the way. For many years we have fought for parity prices for the farmer. That has been the objective of the Members of Congress from the agricultural sections, and that point has been sustained by Congress on numerous occasions. The farmers particularly do not like to get money out of the United States Treasury. They would rather receive parity prices in the market places, because they know that it is not sound for the Government to continually pay out money from the Treasury, especially at a time when we are operating under such tremendous war burdens.

The Department of Agriculture may have several reasons why they want to keep prices down below parity. I will give you one of them. You know a large organization has been built up in the country under the name of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the triple A, and they would like to keep that organization because their work consists in regulating and controlling production in the United States among the farmers on all basic commodities. They send out checks to the farmers of the country. They want to continue to send out those checks to the farmers, and they want to continue to maintain their organization and they know that under the law the moment these farm prices get to parity, there is an end to the entire triple A program. Therefore, they want to continue holding all farm prices down under parity, so that checks may go out and they may continue their tremendous organization throughout the United States for personal and political purposes.

I do not think the prices of farm products are tremendously high at the present time. Just look back at the 1920's, when we were paying much more than we are today, and I think, after all, we from the agricultural sections, should stick by the principle of parity, so that the farmers may get their money in the market places and not from the United States Treasury.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said the question of parity was not involved; that the statute is still on the books, and that the Government had to pay parity just the same; but I submit to you this question in arithmetic: If they beat down the price both on corn and wheat, that means a lower price on all livestock down below parity, and the Government then has to come and buy all the rest and pay parity price, where is the economy?

You read on the highest authority the other day that under this lease-lend we do not expect any repayment. Then why not give this away if you have got too much of it? We are giving food to all our Allies. Charge it off. Charge nothing.

ing. Do not even take that paper scrap. That is one way to get rid of it and not reduce every farm-commodity price.

No. This is an adroit and smooth manner, yet clumsy, of attempting to repeal the parity law without calling it so by name. You could not do that, with the vote by which it was passed in this House. But you want to do it, in effect.

Every man coming from any section of America who remembers the World War and this war knows that the prices of farm products and wages went up together, and that Woodrow Wilson had to pull wheat down and freeze it at \$2—a price at which it never will sell in this war. At the beginning of this war, wages immediately jumped to the first World War wages, but farm prices never traveled very far in that direction, and are far from it now. That great disparity stands there. But what little gains were made, you now propose to give it the knock-out drops. Then you have this propaganda, "Pay off your debts." How can a farmer pay off his debts with his farm labor doubled and everything which he buys with the farm-product dollar moved up in price? How is he going to pay his debts? This disparity is staring him in the face. That is why we want parity today, to maintain at least some degree of equality.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 83, on which we are soon to vote, strikes out the word "and" and inserts the word "or." As a result grain which has deteriorated or grain that is sold for the purpose of feeding or for the purpose of manufacturing into alcohol can be sold below parity. As a matter of fact, those sales that have been made on this alcohol proposition away below parity have not actually affected the market. The sales have been going on for 6 months and they are still going on below parity, without affecting the market. That is a new activity. It means money out of the Federal Treasury when those sales are made for that purpose, in one place or another, either out of war money or out of commodity credit money. It does not make very much difference which.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I do not have the time. If they are not to call grain "deteriorated in quality" by a kind of loose construction which will permit them to call any grain which is over a year old and has been in storage that long "deteriorated," perhaps this language might be needed in order to provide the grain to make alcohol. I cannot see where any farmer is hurt a bit by the adoption of this amendment and I shall favor it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of this House will agree

that during my long service in Congress I have put forth every effort possible in trying to help solve the problems of the farmer and in giving serious consideration to farm legislation. In other words, I have specialized in this line of work in Congress. I realize at this moment it is not the time or the place to write legislation or pass legislation while considering this appropriation bill that will do many things that should be done and that I am interested in having done, but I do believe in the future, especially after this emergency, we should go into all of these farm problems of which there are many. We should revamp much of our farm legislation so as to put it on a sound common-sense business basis and see to it that farmers get that which they have been promised and that which they are entitled to.

We are operating today under confusion with speculation up and down every day, Congress, the House and the Senate, disagreeing; Henderson and Wickard going, in a great many instances, in different directions. Farmers are up in the air with more problems today than ever in the history of the country. I want to say to you without going into the many questions that have been debated here today that I want you to back the House conferees and send this back to conference. I may state to you that during the last 2 or 3 days I have been doing quite a lot of missionary work and I believe that if we send this item back to conference we can work this out on a sound, common-sense, satisfactory basis to all concerned, and bring something back to the House that each of us can agree upon, and settle this problem satisfactorily to the farmers, the consumers, and the White House.

I want to say to my friends who represent consumers and labor—and I represent both—in trying to be helpful to the farmers, that class of people who operate as individuals, and who are helpless and hopeless in controlling and managing their business as to proper marketing and in securing fair prices, that I have always endeavored to try to be fair to labor and to the consumers of this country.

I request that you send this item back to conference. I am not at liberty to tell you just what I have on my mind, but I believe we have a definite arrangement whereby we will work this out in conference perfectly satisfactorily to everybody, do away with all confusion and speculation, give to farmers 100-percent parity without a subsidy, and permit the selling of surplus products in such a manner that will be satisfactory to Wickard, Henderson, and the President.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I would be perfectly willing to send this amendment back to conference if I felt that the conferees might be able to get together on a reasonable solution of the differences between the House and the Senate. A while ago, however, I asked

the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether he had any hope that it would be possible to get together. At that time he informed me he had no such hope. If when we vote today to instruct the conferees, it means that we are urging our conferees to stand irrevocably by the position of the House when we know that the Senate has twice voted to take a diametrically opposite position. Therefore, I feel that I cannot vote to send the bill back to conference with such instructions and no hope of a compromise because if I must make a choice, I favor the Senate provision.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield, although my time is very limited.

Mr. TARVER. I feel that if the gentleman from South Carolina has any substitute proposition in mind, he ought not to keep it a secret but he ought to offer it here as a substitute motion and let the House vote on it.

Mr. HOPE. I think there is something to what the gentleman says. However, I want to speak directly to this amendment. I do not believe that those of us who are in favor of parity price on farm products, in favor of a parity program—and I am talking now to my friends from the corn-producing areas—I do not believe that we can afford to have this present program of loans break down. The only thing that keeps the price of farm products—that is the basic commodities—where it is today, and I am speaking especially of the grains, is the loan program. You cannot keep the loan program going unless you have some control and unless you have some way of disposing of your surplus; it will break down as the Farm Board program broke down.

The price of corn is what it is today, the return to the corn farmer is what it is today, because of the fact he can get a loan at 85 percent of parity. If this program breaks down in any particular—and it is going to break as far as wheat is concerned unless you find some way to move this great surplus of wheat—if you cannot move that, the program is going to break down and then you will get a lot less for corn, wheat, and all these other commodities than you are getting for them today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who made the big argument forgets the fact that we have a legislated price for wheat and corn and have had for years. Had we not had such a price the corn farmers would have been broke and the wheat farmers would have been broke. Only the fact that the farmers had a place where they could go and turn the wheat and corn over to the Government and get, on a nonrecourse note, 85 percent of parity has kept them going. Corn and wheat farmers cannot afford to lose the farm program.

A few years ago we raised 80,000,000 acres of wheat. That has been cut down under the quotas until now it is 55,000,000 acres. That wheat acreage is the minimum under the law. The Department will, perhaps, come to us in a few days and ask us to cut the wheat acreage again. How are you going to vote against that with millions of bushels of wheat in storage and no place to sell it?

I am for the Senate amendment. I cannot see the logic of the position of those who argue so eloquently here for a farm program and deny the Government the right to sell the surplus. We are in danger of breaking the program which has helped so many. I was raising wheat when we had a farm program under Hoover. I held 60,000 bushels of wheat, and I saw it drop 30 cents a bushel in just about 3 days. It just broke the country.

I would vote to raise to full parity the loan value on basic commodities. I would also vote to give the Government the right to sell that wheat anywhere at any price they can get.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

RUBBER FROM AMERICAN FARMS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a story of vital significance to American agriculture, and to the corn and wheat farmers of Indiana and the Middle West, has been unfolding before the Gillette Committee of the Senate in connection with its investigation of the manufacture of synthetic rubber from surplus farm products.

It is a story which deserves, but has not been receiving, front-page headlines—a story with a direct bearing on the problem of surplus grains—a story of how this administration, confronted with a golden opportunity to accomplish something of genuine benefit to agriculture, is mulling the chance and preparing to sell out to the great oil combines.

Committee witnesses have pointed out that, since our principal sources of raw rubber have been wiped out by the Japanese, the war needs of this country in the way of rubber have become so acute as to be almost desperate. New sources for at least 700,000 tons of rubber a year must be developed immediately, the committee has been told.

Where is this much-needed rubber coming from? What new sources of supply are to be developed? These are vital questions that the Gillette Committee has set out to answer.

The answer, of course, is synthetic rubber. It would take years to develop adequate sources of natural rubber on this continent, and time is of the essence. Synthetic rubber is the only practical alternative and our military leaders have known this since December 7.

Synthetic rubber of good quality can be produced rather simply from a chemical substance known as butadiene, which in turn can be derived from two sources—from high-proof alcohol, made from corn, wheat, and other surplus grains, and from petroleum products.

The question therefore arises—and this question is now plaguing official Wash-

ington—Shall our future source of synthetic rubber be surplus farm products or shall it be petroleum? Whatever source is chosen now will probably become a permanent source; thus, we have a clash between agriculture on the one hand and the petroleum interests on the other. The Government is the referee. The decision it makes now will be final.

The production of rubber from surplus farm products—from corn and wheat and rye, even from potatoes and sorghums—is not a mere scientist's dream. A procession of chemists has demonstrated to the Gillette committee, without exception and without dispute, that it can be done. It is a proven process, a practical reality.

Germany, for example, has been doing it for years. Today in Germany there are estimated to be 36,000 small plants, scattered throughout farm areas, for the production of rubber from farm products, and the production of alcohol to be used for power. There were 1,600 such plants existing in Poland before the Nazi invasion.

Polish scientists who perfected the process for producing rubber from grain alcohol are in America today. Their process has been tested in American laboratories, by our own chemists, who have found it practical and workable. It is a simple process, and in actual tests, using corn and wheat, our chemists have been able to produce between 6 and 7 pounds of rubber per bushel of grain.

Committee witnesses have testified that plants for the production of synthetic rubber from farm products can be established throughout the Middle West, convenient to the source of supply, and can be placed in operation within 6 months. The plants would cost approximately \$20,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year, using only a small amount of critical materials. Thus, the Government program of 700,000 tons a year would involve an initial investment of approximately \$140,000,000.

The production of synthetic rubber from petroleum products, on the other hand, is a much costlier and slower process. The initial investment in money and in critical materials would be considerably larger. And it would take at least four times as long to get such processing into operation.

In the face of these facts—in this controversy between the agricultural and petroleum interests—what do you suppose the Government is doing? The Government, or rather the New Deal bureaucrats in charge of the Government, has taken a position in support of the oil combines and in direct opposition to the farmers of America. It has decided to allocate \$650,000,000 for the construction of synthetic rubber plants in this country, and every dollar—mark this carefully—is being allocated to the petroleum industry. Agriculture is being cut off without a nickel.

This \$650,000,000 is being advanced to the millionaire owners of the country's largest oil companies—to Du Pont, to Standard Oil, to Pure Oil, to Shell, to Gulf, to Sinclair, to Socony-Vacuum, to

Cities Service, and several others—to finance the construction of synthetic-rubber plants capable of producing 700,000 tons annually from petroleum products.

In return for these millions, what will the Government get? It will get rubber, yes; but how soon? Conservative estimates indicate that it will take at least 2 years to get these plants into operation. Two long years of waiting for rubber that our planes, tanks, trucks, and armored units need today—desperately. At least 3 or 4 years before rubber is available for civilian use, in the form of tires for defense workers, farmers, and others, who even now are threatened with gasoline rationing as a rubber-conservation measure.

After the war, which will end, God willing, sooner or later, these Government-financed plants will be owned and controlled by the great oil companies, and their profits will flow into the pockets of a selfish group of eastern millionaires.

This, then, is the bill of goods that the petroleum interests have sold to a gullible Government. This is the program which the lobbyists and dollar-a-year men of the great oil companies are putting over at the expense of the people, and of American farmers in particular.

Summing up briefly, if the petroleum industry obtains a monopoly on the production of our synthetic rubber needs:

First. It will cost the Government \$650,000,000 to finance the program.

Second. It will take at least 2 years to get production under way.

Third. Large amounts of critical metals will be required.

Fourth. After the war the plants will be owned and controlled by a few millionaire oil barons and operated for their exclusive enrichment.

On the other hand, if agriculture were to have control of the program:

First. It would cost the Government only \$140,000,000.

Second. It would take only 6 months to get plants in operation.

Third. Critical materials required would be much smaller.

Fourth. After the war, plants using surplus grains would serve as a steadying influence in our agricultural economy, perhaps averting a post-war depression, and benefits would accrue to millions of our citizens rather than a few millionaires.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider another phase of this picture. For the past several years the Government has been paying out millions of dollars in subsidies to encourage farmers to decrease production of corn and wheat. Even today the farmers in my district are being penalized for overproducing. In spite of this fact, the present surplus of corn and wheat is so large that storage facilities are taxed to capacity, and there is danger that some of the present crop will be left to rot in the fields.

Testifying before the Gillette committee, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard reported that the current wheat supply is the largest in history, and that we will start the new crop year, July 1, with a carry-over of 630,000,000 bushels. When

this year's crop is harvested, he estimates we will have a total supply of almost 1,500,000,000 bushels.

Secretary Wickard urged that at least 80,000,000 bushels of wheat be used each year to produce 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol, using existing distilleries. This in turn would produce approximately 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

Carrying Secretary Wickard's recommendation even farther, Senator GILLETTE has pointed out that if agriculture were given the job of producing our entire annual rubber requirements—700,000 tons—approximately 230,000,000 bushels of surplus grain would be taken out of storage bins, and off the market, each year.

Evidence received by the committee, however, makes it clear that the war program not only excludes agriculture from the production of rubber, it contemplates no expansion whatever of distilling facilities for the production of grain alcohol.

Group after group has come to Washington—from Nebraska, from Missouri, from South Dakota, from Illinois, and from other States—and asked for means to establish grain alcohol plants in their territories. In every instance, they have been turned down, sometimes by dollar-a-year men still drawing pay from the petroleum industry.

One cooperative group from Nebraska, headed by Dr. Leo M. Christensen, of the University of Nebraska chemistry project, and other imminent scientists, came here and said they were ready to develop five Midwest plants for the production of butadiene from alcohol, immediately. They were told that money would not be forthcoming from any Government agency for financing their plants.

So they returned home and raised the money—every dollar of it. Back in Washington they said, "We have our funds. We don't need Government financing." They were then informed that they could not have the materials, that they were needed in the war effort.

Not daunted, they sent men out over the country to obtain options on second-hand equipment which was standing idle in plants closed by the war. They succeeded in obtaining 80 percent of the required equipment in this fashion, without help from the Government. Returning here, with the options in their pocket, they requested priorities on the remaining 20 percent. The answer they received was: "We do not care if you need only 2 percent. You cannot have it."

Mr. Speaker, the obvious and sensible thing for the Government to do, if it is really interested in finding a solution to our agricultural problems, is to take the surplus grain it has stored away and use it in the production of grain alcohol and butadiene. We could then obtain a large supply of synthetic rubber in a short time, and by doing so could reduce the present surplus of grain which constitutes such a problem to the farmers of the country. The Government has it on hand and owns it. If it is kept it will deteriorate in value and serve as a constant threat to the corn and wheat parity programs.

But, instead, the Government is granting millions of dollars to the large oil companies to enable them to manufacture rubber out of petroleum products, shipping the petroleum long distances and tying up our already overburdened transportation system. It has turned a deaf ear to those of us who wish to use surplus grains for the manufacture of rubber, in plants conveniently located in the farm States, adjacent both to raw materials and to markets for byproducts.

The only possible reason we can imagine for this is the powerful influence the petroleum interests have in the War Production Board and other agencies of the Government. Either that, or this administration has forsaken the farmers completely and just is not interested in providing constructive, permanent outlets for surplus farm products and developing a sound economy for agriculture, independent of Government subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of cost of production, of speed in acquiring supplies of much-needed rubber, of accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number, and from the standpoint of a fair and equitable solution to our agricultural problems, I want to plead with my colleagues to exert their utmost influence in behalf of surplus farm products as the speediest, most economic and most practical source of synthetic rubber.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point to include a letter from Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and a newspaper article from the Washington Star of June 24, 1942.

The letter and news story follow:

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 16, 1942.
Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: As you are a member of the House Agricultural Committee, I wish to present what I think to be an issue of great import in the ultimate solution of the economic farm problem for the future.

There has been a controversy for a number of years as to the blending of high-proof alcohol with gasoline as an efficient motor fuel. Numerous tests and experiments have revealed the efficiency of such a blend, but it has been vigorously opposed by the petroleum interests because this fuel alcohol would supplant something like 10 percent of the gasoline for motor consumption.

Now, we have the possible use of high-proof alcohol made from corn, wheat, and other commodities containing starch and from which can be made the substance butadiene from which synthetic rubber is made. This is identical with the butadiene which is made from petroleum products and for which the petroleum industry in America is fighting to gain a monopoly. I have absolute proof of the sound economy of the making of synthetic rubber from high-proof alcohol as compared with that made from petroleum products. We are made to wonder at the attitude of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in supplying funds to the petroleum interests rather than to the grain interests of our country.

To produce rubber from petroleum will cost \$93,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year and will require approximately 2 years to get such processing

into operation. To produce rubber from grain will cost approximately \$25,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year and can be placed in operation within a 6-month period from the date the "go" sign is given for the construction of such plants.

Since the sources of rubber from the Dutch East Indies have been completely annihilated, and since it will be at least 7 years before there can be any further sources of rubber from these islands, there is naturally a clamor as to what the sources of rubber in our country shall be. Whatever becomes the source in this 7-year period will in all probability become a permanent source; consequently, the clash between petroleum and agricultural interests of our country.

The directing head of the Sun Oil Co. owns and controls the National Farm Journal and employs an editor who is also the executive official of the National Chemurgic Council, apparently for the specific purpose of protecting the petroleum industry at every instance where petroleum and agricultural interests clash.

The Standard Oil Co has a close-working relationship with the National Distilleries—which incidentally constitutes the largest distilling corporation in America—and with an overlapping personnel, apparently for the specific purpose of protecting the petroleum interests when conflicts occur.

Now comes H. V. Kaltenborn, one of the highest-paid news analysts of the world, a broadcaster over National Broadcasting Co., and paid by the Pure Oil Co. In his June 15 broadcast he severely criticized any attempt at making synthetic rubber from grain and advocated petroleum as the source, and presented statements contrary to the facts as revealed by scientific studies by individuals and groups interested in the earliest production of rubber supplies for our country.

If the petroleum industry becomes the source of synthetic rubber for the future, the money will flow into the pockets of a small group of millionaire interests, and furthermore, will tend to deplete the future source of supply as all oil wells are sooner or later exhaustible. For agriculture to become the future source of the synthetic rubber supply of our country will mean that the income will flow into the pockets of millions of our citizens rather than a few millionaires, and the supply will be replenishable year after year.

The farmers of America drifted away from their own source of power when they turned from horses and mules to the tractor. They made grains cheap and petroleum products high. We now have an opportunity to recover for the farmer a constructive outlet for a considerable portion of his products, which, in my opinion, will go further in solving the future economic problems of agriculture than any other steps which could be taken at this time.

From the opposition to the manufacture of rubber from grain exerted by the petroleum industry it appears that the petroleum interests would rather have the war prolonged another 1½ years than have the petroleum industry lose out on the opportunity to manufacture rubber for carrying on the war and for domestic purposes.

Yours very sincerely,
HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1942]

SENATE UNIT APPROVES RUBBER SUPPLY AGENCY
USING FARM PRODUCTS—LEGISLATION WOULD
GIVE ORGANIZATION SUPREME AUTHORITY OVER
FIELD

The Senate Agriculture Committee approved legislation today to create a rubber supply agency to have supreme authority in

the field of increasing synthetic rubber production from agriculture and forest products.

The President would appoint a director whose duty it would be, the legislation said, to "make available at the earliest possible time, an adequate supply of rubber which, when added to rubber being supplied by other agencies, will be sufficient to meet the military and civilian needs."

Meanwhile, a pioneer experimenter in synthetic rubber told a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee that the country had sufficient raw materials now to produce enough rubber for military needs.

The Senate group, seeking a method of producing an abundant domestic supply of rubber from alcohol derived from grain, heard Dr. O. R. Sweeney of the Ohio State College of Agriculture, contending that grain was the sole source available in enough quantities to meet the Nation's rubber needs.

"Therefore," he asserted, "it would be advisable to make alcohol from grain and produce it in quantities as rapidly as needed and convert it into rubber."

"If we do this within the year, we will be able to produce enough rubber for our war needs."

Dr. Sweeney also declared that from his experiments and other knowledge of synthetic rubber production, the use of alcohol was a cheaper process.

"It would be more complicated and would take longer to produce it from petroleum than from grain," he added.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before the House. The question you are voting on here is, Are you going to cut the farmer's pay? Of course, there is the incidental question, Will you preserve parity or destroy parity?

Out of all the welter of legislation for all other groups Congress has given the farmer only one and that is parity. This amendment proposes to destroy parity. It proposes to destroy it now and destroy it after the war. It proposes to eliminate the only safeguard you have ever given the farmer, the only assurance of a living price for his products; and his products are his wages. So in voting to cut parity you are voting to cut the farmer's pay.

The farmer works longer and harder than any other group. Is there anyone on this floor now who will dispute that statement? If so I give him the opportunity to rise now and be heard. No one rises, of course not. The farmer works from sunup until sundown, he works every day in the week, he does not take off Saturday and the stock must be fed Sunday. He works longer and harder than any other group in America.

The farmer receives less pay than any other group in America. Will anybody here dispute that statement? If so, let him speak now or forever hold his peace. The per capita income of the farmer is about one-fourth of that of the non-farmer.

The farmer works harder and receives less pay and he does the job better than

any other group in America today. He is producing the most essential munitions of war and he has continued to produce it until we have surpluses piled up on every side. The farmer works longer and does a better job and receives less pay than anybody else. And now in this amendment it is proposed to reduce even that little pay, and a vote for the amendment is a vote to sell his products at less than parity—a vote to reduce his pay.

Are you going to do that? Are you going to single out the man who works the hardest, who does the best job, who gets the least—and cut his pay—when everybody else is reaping the richest harvest in history?

I do not believe this House or the American people are that heartless.

The farmer is the only worker in America who supplements his own work with the work of his family. On the farm the man's wife and the man's children work with him, all for the one wage. When you vote to reduce the pay of the farmer by selling at less than parity, you are voting to reduce the pitiable pittance that the farmer's wife receives for her labor and the meager pay the farmer's children receive. Are you going to do that? I do not believe this House will do it. I do not believe that the American people will permit you to do it.

The American farmer is less adequately nourished than any other worker in America. I have been on dairy farms which sold cream every day but did not serve a drop of cream on their table. I have been on farms where they raised cattle and never served beef on their table. I have been on farms which sold eggs every day and never served an egg on the table except the eggs that were cracked, broken, or unsalable. Everything that was salable had to go to market to pay the interest and the taxes.

That was proven when the statistics were compiled of men who were rejected in the draft because of malnourishment. The greatest number, the larger percentage of men in my State, were rejected from the draft who came from farms because they had not had the proper diet than were rejected from the city. Let me tell you, if any of you people are out of a job, if you are hungry, and if you will go to the farmer's house and ask him either at the front door or the back door, the farmer will share his meager fare with you. I do not believe that the American people who dine sumptuously every day on cream, eggs, beef, and ham that the farmer raises, are going to ask the farmer for a handout at less than it costs the farmer to produce it. Yet that is what you propose to do here.

My good friend said that he raised cotton and he raised tobacco in his country, therefore he was not concerned, but the future of the whole agricultural industry is bound up in this amendment. If you break parity for one, you break parity for all. What happened when they began to sell at less than parity? Not only wheat, corn, and rye, and oats dropped immediately and drastically, but cotton went down \$15 a bale, and it stayed down until they got assurances that no more cotton would be sold by the Government. A Member on this floor who raises cattle told me not more

than 30 minutes ago that as a result of this campaign against farm prices the price of his cattle had declined on an average of \$30 a steer. O Mr. Speaker, when you affect one American farm product you affect all farm products. They are following the Hitler method, "divide and conquer." They are taking us one at a time and if you sit here and let them rob one, it is only a question of time before they get around to you.

The attitude of labor has been referred to. I am pro-labor. Judged by my votes for labor bills, I belong to the labor bloc. I have voted for every bill that was calculated to improve the status of labor that has ever been presented to this House in the last 20 years.

I have followed William Green and Samuel Gompers, of revered memory, from my youth up. Samuel Gompers and William Green and Philip Murray have contributed more to human progress, have done more to foster American prosperity, and have added more to the sum total of human happiness than half the Governors, Congressmen, statesmen, and politicians throughout the Nation in the last half century.

I have followed them because I believed labor and agriculture have a common cause. Both must win their bread with their hands. Both of them fight the battle of the weak against the strong. Both have been exploited by commercialized greed. So they have a common cause. For years these leaders of men have preached the doctrine of the rights of the toiler, the right of the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow to a fair wage. Never yet have I heard them advocate a cut in the pay of a man who bears his share of the burden of life. And I do not believe they advocate it now. I do not believe any one of them favors cutting the farmer's pay. I say here and now, not a single labor leader in America is for this amendment. I ask the House to vote down the amendment and give the farmer and his wife and children at least a parity wage for their toil and sacrifice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House still further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. On that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 125, answered "present" 1, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—177

Allen, Ill.	Barden	Boren
Allen, La.	Barnes	Brooks
Andersen,	Baumhart	Brown, Ga.
H. Carl	Bender	Bryson
Andresen,	Bennett	Butler
August H.	Bishop	Byron
Arends	Boggs	Camp
Arnold	Bonner	Cannon, Mo.

Cartwright
Case, S. Dak.
Chipperfield
Claypool
Clevenger
Collins
Colmer
Cooper
Copeland
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Creal
Crowther
Cunningham
Davis, Tenn.
Day
Dirksen
Domeneaux
Dondero
Doughton
Duncan
Dworshak
Edmiston
Elliot, Calif.
Engel
Englebright
Fitzgerald
Flannagan
Ford, Miss.
Fulmer
Gathings
Gibson
Gillie
Gore
Gossett
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Guyer
Gwynne
Halleck
Hare
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hébert
Heldinger
Hill, Colo.
Hill, Wash.
Hobbs

Howell
Jackson
Jacobsen
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johns
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, W. Va.
Jones
Jonkman
Keefe
Kelly, Ill.
Kerr
Kinzer
Kleberg
Knutson
Kramer
Lambertson
Lanham
Lea
LeCompte
Ludlow
McGregor
McIntyre
McLaughlin
McMillan
Magnuson
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Michener
Mills, La.
Moser
Mott
Mundt
Nelson
Nichols
Norrell
O'Hara
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patton
Pearson
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.

Pittenger
Floeser
Plumley
Poage
Priest
Ramspeck
Rankin, Miss.
Rankin, Mont.
Rees, Kans.
Richards
Rivers
Robinson, Utah
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Russell
Sanders
Shafer, Mich.
Short
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
South
Sparkman
Springer
Steagall
Stefan
Stevenson
Stratton
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Tenerowicz
Terry
Thomason
Tibbott
Van Zandt
Vinson, Ga.
West
Wheat
White
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Williams
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wright
Zimmerman

NAYS—125

Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andrews
Angell
Bates, Mass.
Beam
Beiter
Bell
Bloom
Boehne
Bulwinkle
Burgin
Canfield
Carlson
Carter
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clark
Cochran
Coffee, Wash.
Cooley
Costello
Culkin
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Dewey
Dingell
Disney
Ditter
Downs
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliot, Mass.
Elston
Faddis
Fellows
Fitzpatrick
Flaherty
Folger
Ford, Thomas F.
Gale

Gamble
Gearhart
Gehrmann
Gerlach
Gregory
Hancock
Hartley
Healey
Hinshaw
Holbrook
Holland
Holmes
Hope
Houston
Hull
Hunter
Imhoff
Jenks, N. H.
Johnson, Calif.
Kean
Kefauver
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kopplemann
Kunkel
Lane
Lesinski
Lewis
McCormack
McGranery
McLean
MacLora
Martin, Mass.
May
Meyer, Md.
Miller
Monroney
Murdock
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Connor
Paddock

Pheiffer
William T.
Pierce
Rabaut
Ramsay
Reed, N. Y.
Rich
Robertson, Va.
Rogers, Mass.
Rolph
Sabath
Sauthoff
Scrugham
Shanley
Sheppard
Simpson
Smith, Maine
Smith, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.
Spence
Stearns, N. H.
Sullivan
Sutphin
Taber
Thill
Thom
Thomas, Tex.
Tolan
Treadway
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Wadsworth
Ward
Wasielewski
Welch
Wigglesworth
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Young
Youngdahl

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall, Leonard W.

NOT VOTING—129

Baldwin
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth

Blackney
Bolton
Boykin

Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Brown, Ohio
Buck

Buckler, Minn.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burch
Burdick
Byrne
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Casey, Mass.
Celler
Clason
Cluett
Coffee, Nebr.
Cole, Md.
Cole, N. Y.
Crosser
Cullen
Culley
Davis, Ohio
Delaney
Dickstein
Dies
Douglas
Drewry
Ellis
Fenton
Fish
Fogarty
Forand
Ford, Leland M.
Gavagan
Gifford
Gilchrist
Gillette
Green
Haines
Hall
Hart
Harter
Heffernan
Hendricks

Hess
Hoffman
Hook
Izac
Jarrett
Jenkins, Ohio
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson
Lyndon B.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Martin J.
Kennedy
Michael J.
Keogh
Kilday
Klein
Kociakowski
Landis
Larrabee
Leavy
Lynch
McGehee
McKeough
Maas
Maciejewski
Marcantonio
Merritt
Mills, Ark.
Mitchell
Murray
Myers, Pa.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Day
O'Leary
Oliver
Osmer
Patrick
Pfeifer
Joseph L.
Plauché

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Baldwin against.
Mr. Harness for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Gilchrist for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Leavy with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Sasser.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Randolph.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Kee with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Traynor.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARNES. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amend-

ments Nos. 85 and 86 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 85: On page 81, line 18, after "Agriculture", insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes."

Senate amendment No. 86: On page 81, beginning in line 20, insert the following: "Provided further, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 85 and 86.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 90 and 91, relating to the Farm Tenant Act and the appropriation made for the carrying out of the provisions of that act, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: On page 84, line 19, strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 91: On page 81, line 22, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments with certain amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 90 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$1,625,000."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in the said amendment, insert "\$32,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if the motion he has just made is approved by a majority of the conferees or by a majority of the subcommittee in charge of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that I expect to explain that matter fully in connection with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, these two amendments relate to the farm-tenant land purchase program, one of them relating to the item of administrative expenses and the other to the item making provisions for loans.

When the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, it

contained a provision for \$45,000,000 in loans. The Budget estimate for administrative expenses was \$2,500,000.

The House reduced the provisions for these items to \$1,250,000, one-half of the Budget estimate for administrative expenses, and to \$25,000,000, or \$20,000,000 below the figures in the bill as reported from the committee for the loan feature of the program. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate increased the item for administrative expenses to \$2,000,000, which was still \$500,000 below the Budget estimate, and increased the figures for the loan program to \$40,000,000 which was exactly the amount of the Budget estimate.

We have been in conference with the Senate with regard to these differences for quite a long while. Apparently, we have exhausted every possibility of arriving at an agreement concerning these appropriations, unless the House would be willing to accept the compromise motion which I have offered and which, if it is adopted, would divide in half the differences between the House and the Senate, appropriating for the administrative expense item \$1,625,000 instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and an amount which would be \$875,000 below the Budget and appropriating \$32,500,000 for the loan program, which would be \$7,500,000 above the House figures and \$7,500,000 below the Senate figures and, likewise, below the Budget.

Your subcommittee which serves as conferees on this bill, is evenly divided on this question. The motion which I have offered has not been offered in behalf of the conferees, but only in behalf of four of the conferees, including myself, which four constitute one-half of the committee on conference.

We have been advised that if the House should approve this compromise motion the Senate will accept. That is, accept the compromise, and the difficulties with reference to this particular portion of the bill will be eliminated. It is impossible, as I am sure you understand, that the House conferees in conference should be able to procure Senate acceptance of every House position. Especially is this true when half of the House conferees believe that the Senate position is fair.

So, under these circumstances we are appealing to you by offering this compromise motion to permit the enactment of this legislation by the first of the next fiscal year. Unless we can reach a basis for compromise, and this seems to be a fair basis, there does not appear any possibility of agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I will yield to the gentleman later.

The Senate on yesterday voted, as I recall, 52 to 7, to insist upon its position with reference to these particular amendments. This is an overwhelming majority. The Senate is a coordinate legislative body. If we are to arrive at legislation in connection with this bill, that is, if we are to pass an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture at all, we must accord to their viewpoint proper consideration.

I do not think it is appropriate at this time to reenter into a discussion of the arguments pro and con with regard to the farm-tenant-land-purchasing program. I am one of those who have observed in my own district and among a farm population which is two-thirds tenant, wonderful results. There have been wonderful accomplishments, not only for the tenants who have participated by being granted loans, but by improving the morale of all tenants, most of whom have not secured loans but yet have held up before them the incentive of so improving their farm records and their business records in the management of their crops as to show that they would probably repay a loan if one should be granted. Those who have been the beneficiaries of this program have repaid in excess of 99 percent of their current obligations, and prepayments of obligations not yet due would bring the amount to 120 percent of their obligations.

As against this, the business interests of this country who have borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are delinquent on their loans to the extent of 7.7 percent, while the percentage of delinquencies on these loans is less than 1 percent. When the poor American farm tenant is able to establish a record like that and make repayments to his Government of almost 100 percent of his current liabilities and some 6 or 7 percent above the percentage of repayments made by the business interests of this country into whose laps have been poured billions of dollars from the Federal Treasury, he is indeed making a record of which he is entitled to be proud.

But aside from that, I am appealing to you upon the basis of compromise and the enactment of this bill in some reasonable form to agree to the compromise proposal which I have submitted. It does not represent what I would do if the decision were left to me. I would not decrease this program at all, but I am endeavoring to find some basis upon which this matter of dispute may be satisfactorily worked out between the two Houses.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman what suggestion the conferees intend to make with regard to amendments No. 95 and No. 96.

Mr. TARVER. I think we ought to defer discussion of those amendments until we reach them, I will say to my colleague. I think we ought to pass upon these matters one at a time, but we hope in connection with those amendments also to offer a compromise proposal for the consideration of the House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand the position of the gentleman, this appropriation bill is for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, which is Wednesday of next week?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And unless some compromise is made, and the

bill finally passed, the fiscal year will begin without appropriations for this important work, and, as I understand, that is the motive that actuates the gentleman in offering this compromise?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. Unless we provide appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the situation will be serious.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he believes the Senate and the Senate conferees will agree to the compromise that the gentleman has just offered?

Mr. TARVER. The Senate conferees have indicated that there is a very strong sentiment against any recession on the part of the Senate, but they have also indicated that if the House will agree to this compromise, they will recommend to the Senate that the House position be accepted.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I think the motion of the gentleman ought to be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for talking again about this matter, but this keeps coming back here and there is nothing new which can be said on it. However, let us get clearly what is before us. The chairman of the subcommittee is not speaking for the majority of the subcommittee. He is speaking for half of that committee, not the majority of them. Under the rules, we have to defeat the gentleman's motion before we can even vote to insist upon the position of the House, strange to say, because the gentleman has taken an attitude that is his now and not an attitude of the majority of the subcommittee. Under his motion to concur with an amendment, we have to vote upon it before we can vote on the original position of the House, as he has already explained to us. This is the easiest thing in the whole agricultural appropriation bill on which to insist on the House position. There is nothing in this at all that is in any way connected with national defense. Back there on some of these other amendments we did have something of that kind, but here is an amendment put in by another body that insists upon selling the surplus with a concealed intention of reducing the price to save inflation, and now they come in here with something which is really inflationary, a proposition to loan money to buy land when land values are rising. This is something not needed at this time. If there is anything in the world that is inflationary, it is to loan men money to buy land when the price is advancing, and when it has nothing to do with defense. I hope, without taking any more time, that we will defeat this motion of the gentleman from Georgia, and then the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] can make his motion to insist upon the position of the House that we

have maintained here once or twice on a record vote overwhelmingly. This has nothing whatever to do with defense.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have met twice on these amendments and changes in the bill, and they have spent many hours in trying to get together. The Senate feels just as strongly in favor of the amendments that it has inserted as some of the Members of the House felt when they lowered the amounts that were reported out by the subcommittee. I feel we should follow the suggestion made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Judge TARVER, and accept the compromise proposition of splitting the difference. Splitting the difference, of course, is a very ancient method of settling disputes, but, taking it by and large, it generally arrives at an equitable disposition, at a time when each side thinks that it is right.

I feel that the farm-tenant purchase program under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act is one of the best legislative programs that has been put through the House. It gives an opportunity to landless tenants to become farm owners. Under the program that was established we provided for loans from the R. F. C., and when the record is that these loans are being repaid 99 percent, and the borrowers—these men who are put on these small farms—are carrying out their contracts and paying their interest, insurance, and the amount of the installments, it seems to me that we should go along with the program, even though some may not call it a 100-percent war program. It is a war program to the extent that the Agricultural Department is calling upon the small farms in the country to produce food for victory, which is so essential now, and which will become more essential in the days to come, when this country of ours will be called upon to feed the starving peoples of the world.

There is no getting away from the fact that the United States, the people of America, will be called upon to feed starving Europe, to feed France and Poland and Czechoslovakia, and the other people who cannot get their food in any other way. That will be the obligation of this country, and we will need this food for that purpose.

On the question of rehabilitation loans, I want you to consider that these loans are made to the poorest group of people in the United States; that they have repaid the loans, over 80 percent, and that the repayments are made largely because of the supervision that has been given the loans by the Farm Security Administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield just time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], chairman of the subcom-

mittee, which compromises the amount of difference between the Senate and the House on Senate amendment 91, relating to the appropriation for the farm-tenant land-purchase program.

He has so well stated the case and the reasons for the compromise that I shall not discuss it further at this time, except to say that the 97-percent repayments made by the farmers to whom these loans are made should of itself be persuasive that this money is well spent.

The commercial loans made by the R. F. C. and other Government agencies do not begin to compare with this record of the farmers in repaying these loans.

The wonderful record made by the farmers in these repayments calls to mind that the farmers have not been getting very much recognition for the good work they have been doing. There is no class of our citizenship which has more patriotically supported the war program than the farmers of America. They were told by the Government to produce more food, and that food was equally important, and they have been carrying out this request of the Government.

A letter from one of the county agents in my district states that they are working 12 and 16 hours a day, the women driving tractors, children working long hours, many of their boys in the Army, no strikes and no complaining, and the food which the Government has asked for is being produced in abundance, in spite of all handicaps.

The patriotic example set by this group of citizens is entitled to the highest commendation, and sometimes I think that Government officials, the press, and the Congress overlook giving credit where credit is due.

The farmers in my section of the State have had adverse weather conditions, excessive rains, insects, and shortage of labor, and they have been making a crop under great difficulties, but there has been no complaining and they have been carrying on as patriotic Americans.

I trust that our high Government officials, the press, and the radio commentators, when they are singing the praises of those who are contributing to our Government in winning this war, will not overlook the farmers of America, who are playing their part heroically and faithfully, and with pecuniary benefits far less than that of any other group in America.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the judgment of the House is always pretty substantial when it gets all the facts.

There is involved here an increase over the amount in the House bill for administrative expenses for the Farm Tenant Act of \$375,000, plus \$7,500,000 increase over the position of the House for loans. That is a very substantial amount of money.

It is contended that we ought to vote for it on the ground that the program under which Uncle Sam buys farms for tenants over a period of 40 years at 3

percent, stocks them, builds the necessary outbuildings, ought to be continued at a high level, and particularly now. With that position I thoroughly disagree. I think I can assign a half dozen reasons why I disagree, reasons which in my humble judgment are quite persuasive.

The first reason is that we have got no business expanding a program of this kind when land values are rising. Who says they are rising? The Department of Agriculture. Examine their official bulletin for May. What do they say? For the Nation as a whole, land values have increased in the last year 7 percent. In the State of Indiana they increased 14 percent. Here is what the author of the article, over the signature of the Department, says in the last paragraph:

A continuation of last year's trend would, in a number of areas, soon put market values above those which could be supported by the expected future earning power of the land.

The Department says that if they continue this year as they have done—and this money is for this fiscal year—that the earnings from the land will not support the investment. Do you propose to put the seal of approval upon the expansion of this program under those circumstances? I do not.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] just stated that these lands were delinquent by only 1 percent. He does not tell the whole story. We have been in the business of buying farms for 4 years. We have bought 23,000 farms for tenants. That is an average of about 6,000 a year. But over 10,000 of those tenants got loans, and 124 of them got outright grants. That is what the record shows. I will take that kind of a program and never have a delinquency if you will just give me enough money to give them a loan every year to keep them from becoming delinquent.

Yes. There is another side to the story. We are going to buy 4,700 farms in this next fiscal year, and the man who is going to administer it, Mr. Baldwin, states to our committee that the number of farms that exchanged hands in the 12 months of 1941, for reasons of foreclosure and credit distress, was 575,000. Five hundred and seventy-five thousand farms changed hands, and Uncle Sam dips into that great reservoir and lifts out an infinitesimal amount and invests his money, in an hour when land values are rising, when a great many of these tenant purchasers have to be supplemented with loans and grants to keep them going. Is that such a successful program? I doubt it very much.

If you want to see what the basic credit situation is at the present time, I submit to you that the record will show that 60 percent of all farm-loan associations in the country are delinquent today and cannot make a loan. It is in the record. There are 3,583 of these associations that make loans to buy farms, and 2,047 are so delinquent now, according to the Farm Credit Administration testimony before our committee, that they cannot make loans today. There is something basically wrong. Shall we

throw good money after bad by expanding this program and supporting that motion and adding \$7,500,000 more for more loans and \$375,000 for administrative expenses when this whole matter needs intimate exploration and revamping?

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] speaks eloquently about food for victory, food for freedom. Is it going to make any difference whether John Doe who is on that farm now, farms it and provides milk and meat and eggs and poultry, or whether Jim Brown, who lives down the road about 10 miles, finally finds himself the recipient of a Federal loan whereby he can buy that farm?

Is that going to make any difference as far as the sum total of "foods for freedom" is concerned? I am just afraid that too much of this is predicated on the philosophy of keeping these folks in debt, and perhaps we ought to have a complete reappraisal and revaluation of this whole program before we add more money to it. It is too early to tell how this will come out. Oh, yes. Provide loans and grants and obviously on the books of the Farm Security Administration you can keep them from becoming delinquent. But let the experience of 2 or 3 or more years come along. Let there be readjustment after the period of conflict, when there is torsion upon the whole economic fabric of the world, and then see what the score is.

We saw what it was in 1929; farmers were buying land for \$500 an acre out there in the State of Illinois just after the last war. After a while they were licking their chops and nursing their wounds as it went down to the point where it would not even liquidate the mortgage. That is when farm values dropped and the price of commodities dropped, and we may go through that maladjustment all over again. So there is not a good, sound, defensible reason for expanding the program at this time. This is a time for caution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may get clearly the matters in controversy here I want to take just a moment to point them out.

The first amendment is an amendment dealing with farm tenants which combine with the amendment for the expense and then there are two further amendments coming up under farm security, one dealing with the general expense for the operation of the agency of \$50,000,000, and the other dealing with rehabilitation loans. I am going to discuss only two now involved, but I want to say that of the four the two major amendments are not direct appropriations at all out of the Federal Treasury. The Farm Tenant Act item of \$40,000,000, by the amendment which has been offered by the chairman of the House conferees making it \$32,500,000, is money borrowed from the R. F. C., and it is money that is being and has been repaid to the extent of about 97 or 98 percent. The rehabilitation loan was raised by the Senate to \$125,000,000. In

the House bill it was \$70,000,000. This likewise is money borrowed from the R. F. C. and is money that is being repaid with interest similar to the Farm Credit or farm-land bank loans. My friend from Illinois refers to the farm-land-bank units being in default. The difference is here, these people are all farmers who are so low in the scale of credit that they cannot get money from any other agency, a commercial bank, farm-loan bank, or any other agency, and yet their history over the 4 or 5 years where this type of loan has been advanced is that they are paying them back, making a remarkable record.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. If I have time, I will yield later.

Practically 97 or 98 percent of the loans that are made to them are being paid back.

It is argued that you are not changing this terrific current of increasing tenant farmers but that you are creating new tenants out of farmers. This program never was intended to eliminate tenancy overnight. It would take a program of billions of dollars to do that; nevertheless it is a step in the right direction. If America is going to survive as the kind of America we want her to be it will be because the man who operates the farm owns the farm, and this program goes a long way in that direction. Personally, if I had my way, I would have receded on the Senate amendments in full, and have given Farm Security the whole amount provided by the Senate amendment. This cannot be done. We here in the House must compromise when we finally reach what seems to be an impasse, and that is the situation here. I think the House certainly should make this concession of striking a difference between the two amounts, because they are both far under Budget estimates.

The statement that this has nothing to do with national defense is not based upon facts, because aside from the three basic crops, corn, wheat, and cotton, we actually have a shortage now, and I am willing to predict that in less than a year, probably within 6 months, there will not only be rationing of tires, gasoline, and sugar, but there will be rationing of at least a dozen farm crops.

This program does what? It tremendously increases that type of crop that is not included in the corn, wheat, cotton, program; it involves some 300,000 farmers, who would be given a chance to help produce essential foods.

I hope the amendment offered by the chairman will prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to an interesting coincidence? The question of appropriations for this purpose has come before the House for debate over a period of years more frequently than any other item in the agricultural appropriations bill, and in all the years in which it has been the most voted-on item in the Agricultural appropriations bill, never on a

roll call has the House failed to defeat it by an overwhelming majority. And here it is again this year.

The three distinguished gentlemen who have spoken are the only three members of the eight members of the conferees' committee who spoke in behalf of this proposition—only three out of the eight. I do not believe there are three more able men in the House, and I am certain there are no more valuable men in the House than these three, but in all these years, on every vote, they have been in favor of the largest appropriation for this purpose that could be secured. Never yet in any year have they failed to fight for every dollar they could get for this purpose in the committee, in the subcommittee, in the House, and in the conference; and every year they have gone to conference reluctant in their support of the House position.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; I did not mention the gentleman's name, but I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. TERRY. He implied that I was one of the guilty parties.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, not guilty. The gentleman has a right to his opinion, and it is a well-founded opinion from his point of view, but it has never been the opinion of the House.

Mr. TERRY. I may say to the gentleman that when our subcommittee reports an item and approves it, I stand with the subcommittee. I do not do like the gentleman does.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman stays with the subcommittee, but not with the House. I cannot express too strongly my admiration and my regard for all three of these gentlemen, and I say this from the heart. They have as much right to their views as I have to mine, and perhaps with better logic, but I am calling attention to the fact that never has their opinion agreed with the opinion of the House, and they as conferees are supposed to represent the House. They have made a strong appeal for the Senate position; there is no doubt about that. I am supporting the House position in accordance with our instructions when we were appointed to represent the House. I may be wrong. I am wrong many times, and I do not claim to be right this time. But I am certain I am carrying out the instructions imposed on our committee by a majority vote of the House on two separate occasions.

And the position of the House is sound. The House does not propose to discontinue tenant loans. It provides \$25,000,000 for that purpose. But the Senate is not satisfied. It wants \$40,000,000. The House does not propose to withdraw funds from a single farmer who has benefited by this law in the past. The House not only preserves the rights and privileges of all who in the past have been selected for these benefits but it in addition provides for \$25,000,000 more new loans. It is a very modest retrenchment. It would be impossible to effect within reason a more conservative economy in this heavy expenditure. There might be some justification for deserting the House position

and going over to the Senate position if the House proposed to discontinue all funds or even discontinue new loans. But that is not the proposition before us. The House still makes generous provision for this dubious experiment. It offers \$26,625,000. Why should not that be sufficient in these stringent times?

Each of the three conferees who has asked to have the \$25,000,000 increased has stressed the fact that all this money would be paid back with interest. I ask my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, if we appropriate the additional \$50,000,000 which the Senate asks in the first amendment, will any of it ever be paid back?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to inform the gentleman that his discussion concerns an amendment which is not under consideration. He is discussing the first amendment to the Farm Security Administration appropriation and not the farm-tenant land-purchase amendment which we now have under consideration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. I had my finger on the next paragraph. Will the gentleman tell us if any of the appropriation for expenses will be paid back in any form?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman stated that we had provided \$25,000,000 for expenses. He must have reference to the Farm Security Administration, because this item as proposed in the substitute is for \$1,625,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask the gentleman if a dollar of the \$1,625,000 will ever come back to the Government?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. The gentleman knows that in this case, as in the case where we maintain the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the benefit of business, the administrative expenses do not come back, but the gentleman has never raised any objection, so far as I know, to the payment of the administrative expenses of that lending corporation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is discussing a question entirely foreign to the subject before us. We are assured that the loans will be repaid with interest—that it will all come back to the Treasury—but not a dollar of this item for expenses, or the millions that have been spent for that purpose in the past, will ever be paid back.

And even if it would be paid back, this is the wrong time to buy land. Wallace's Farmer, and similar dependable publications—even Mr. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration—have warned the farmer against buying high-priced land; have emphasized the inflationary effect of Government loans for purchase of land at this time. After the last war, when the bottom was knocked out of farm prices and millions of farmers and a large percentage of farm banks lost their shirts, the experts all said it was because the farmer had bought land during the war. Now we are in another war and instead of encouraging the purchase of land the Government should discourage inflationary land pur-

chases until the war is over and we get back to normal conditions and normal prices.

Let us wait until after the war to buy land and let us wait until money is available for the purpose. The Government has no money to tie up in Utopian enterprises at this time. Every dollar the Government provides for this purpose must be borrowed. Every dollar the Government hands over in this appropriation must come from the sale of War bonds and War stamps. Some of it must come from the stamps bought by children with their pennies to help win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But, Mr. Speaker, the serious feature of this question is that it is not solving the tenant problem. Tenancy in the United States, according to the last report, is increasing at the rate of 40,000 a year. Although we were spending these millions of dollars to solve the tenant problem and have been spending millions for years, the number of tenants has steadily increased, and is still increasing, at the ruinous rate of 40,000 a year. Only one thing will cure tenancy and that is to pay the farmer a parity price for his products. Then he can buy his own land.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal to appropriate millions for ineffective, wasteful, nonessential, nondefense expenditures. The motion should be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that while the chairman has tried to split between the House and Senate conferees on this question, the House of Representatives and its conference committee refused to raise either of these items a dollar in conference.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just addressed the House is a very lovable person, and it is with deep regret that I take issue with him concerning any matter. He is the chairman of the committee of which I am a member. But the gentleman did not attend a single hearing of our subcommittee when the evidence was developed with reference to this subject matter.

We were in session some three and a half months. The only two hearings of our subcommittee that he attended were the ones at which the Secretary of Agriculture testified and the one at which Mr. O'Neal, the head of the Farm Bureau Federation, testified. Although frequently invited, he declined to attend and hear the evidence of other witnesses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the gentleman would want the House to know that at the time to which he refers I was in attendance on the sessions of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations, re-

porting to the House bills for the national defense carrying the largest appropriations ever made for the Army and the Navy. They required careful consideration and it was, of course, impossible to attend two committee meetings at once. I had been in charge of this bill for a number of years and even longer a member of the subcommittee over which the gentleman now presides so much more ably than I did. I was thoroughly familiar with this bill and especially with this item in the bill. In addition, I have read all the testimony pertaining to the motion. It is the same motion which the gentleman makes every year and which he loses every year.

Mr. TARVER. The effect of the gentleman's statement is that he knows more about the bill, not hearing the evidence, than I do after hearing the evidence. That may be true. However, attending to his duties on the deficiency committee and his other duties has not prevented his attending the meetings of the conference committee. Notwithstanding his failure to hear the evidence relating to these items, he has more pronounced views regarding them than some of the members of the conference committee who did hear the evidence.

I have presented this motion in behalf of four members of the conference committee, constituting one-half of its membership. I sought and secured from the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the consideration of the first conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill a ruling to the effect that I am authorized to submit such a motion under the circumstances that now exist.

This proposal is submitted as a matter of compromise. I hope you will not get away from that fact. We made provision for loans in the amount of \$50,000,000 for the present fiscal year for this purpose. This proposal is \$17,500,000 under that figure.

The gentleman from Missouri says the House has never had a roll-call vote approving appropriations for loans for the tenant land-purchase program. I have not had occasion to investigate the Record as to whether the House has voted approval on roll-call votes, but I do know that loan provisions in the amount of \$50,000,000 could not have been made without votes of the House of Representatives. Anybody who wanted a roll call, if one was not had, could have asked for it, and, if supported by one-fifth of those present, could have procured it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Statements which are not justified have been made concerning the operation of this program. One was made by the gentleman from Illinois, who intimated, if he did not positively aver, that some of the payments made by tenants on their loans were made from grants of the Farm Security Administration. That charge was made before our subcommittee. We investigated it thoroughly and sought evidence of the existence of the charge if such evidence existed, but although we repeatedly called upon witnesses who

intimated that such repayments were being made in that manner and invited the attendance of any witnesses who might have knowledge of any such repayment ever having been made from a grant, we never secured the evidence of a single witness to any transaction of that sort. I therefore feel justified in saying to you that any charge that these tenants are repaying their loans from moneys granted to them by the Farm Security Administration is absolutely without foundation. Not a single witness in the United States, as far as I know, is in position to aver positively that any such fact comes within his own knowledge.

We want, if possible, to wind up the consideration of this bill this evening. In view of the fact that the committee is evenly divided, four to four, that the appropriation is \$7,500,000 below the Budget, if you accept the figures that we have offered here, that it is an equal amount below the Senate figures, that the Senate has voted by a vote of 52 to 7 to insist upon its position but indicates that it would accept this compromise if it is voted up, I ask you in your good judgment to approve it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the Farm Security Administrator never supplied the committee with the data as to whether or not the money had been used for repayment and said he could not unless he could go through all of his files, and that, while we asked for this information, it never was forthcoming to the committee? That is a statement of fact.

Mr. TARVER. I regret I must disagree with my colleague. The Farm Security Administrator testified that no such repayments had been made and no grant had been made which could be utilized for such a purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand the motion now pending, it is a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Therefore, those who desire to maintain the position of the House will have to vote down the motion, in order to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 95.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 131, nays 159, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—131

Allen, La.	Gore	Pace
Andersen,	Gossett	Patman
H. Carl	Granger	Patton
Anderson,	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
N. Mex.	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Arnold	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Barden	Healey	Poage
Barnes	Hill, Wash.	Priest
Beam	Hobbs	Rabaut
Bloom	Holbrook	Ramsay
Boggs	Holland	Ramspeck
Bonner	Hull	Rankin, Miss.
Boren	Hunter	Richards
Brooks	Imhoff	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	Rizley
Bryson	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Byron	Jensen	Russell
Camp	Johnson,	Sabath
Cartwright	Luther A.	Sanders
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sauthoff
Claypool	Kelly, Ill.	Sheppard
Coffee, Wash.	Kerr	Smith, Pa.
Cooley	Kirwan	South
Cooper	Kramer	Sparkman
Courtney	Lane	Spence
Cravens	Leavy	Steagall
Cunningham	McCormack	Sullivan
Curtis	McGranery	Summers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	McIntyre	Tarver
Dingell	McMillan	Terry
Domengaux	Magnuson	Thom
Downs	Mahon	Thomason
Duncan	Manasco	Tibbott
Eberharter	Mansfield	Tolan
Edmiston	Mills, La.	Van Zandt
Eliot, Mass.	Monroney	Vinson, Ga.
Engel	Mundt	Voorhis, Calif.
Fitzgerald	Murdock	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Nelson	White
Flaherty	Nichols	Whitten
Flannagan	Norrell	Wickersham
Folger	Norton	Wright
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Brien, Mich.	Young
Gehrmann	O'Connor	Zimmerman
Gibson	O'Hara	

NAYS—159

Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Lesinski
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Miss.	Lewis
Andresen,	Fulmer	Ludlow
August H.	Gale	McGregor
Andrews	Gamble	McLaughlin
Angell	Gathings	McLean
Arends	Gearhart	Maclora
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Martin, Iowa
Baumhart	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Beiter	Graham	Mason
Bell	Grant, Ala.	May
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Meyer, Md.
Bennett	Guyer	Michener
Bishop	Gwynne	Moser
Boehne	Hall	Mott
Bulwinkle	Edwin Arthur	O'Neal
Butler	Hall	Paddock
Canfield	Leonard W.	Pheliffer,
Cannon, Mo.	Halleck	William T.
Carlson	Hancock	Pierce
Carter	Harris, Va.	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Hartley	Plumley
Chenoweth	Heldinger	Rankin Mont.
Chilperfield	Hill, Colo.	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Hinschaw	Reed, N. Y.
Cochran	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Colmer	Hope	Rich
Copeland	Howell	Robertson, Va.
Costello	Jacobsen	Rockwell
Cox	Jenks, N. H.	Rodgers, Pa.
Crawford	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Creal	Johns	Rolph
Crowther	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Culkin	Johnson, Ill.	Shafer, Mich.
D'Alessandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Shanley
Day	Jones	Short
Dewey	Jonkman	Simpson
Dirksen	Kean	Smith, Maine
Disney	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Ditter	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Klinzer	Smith, Wis.
Doughton	Kleberg	Snyder
Durham	Knutson	Springer
Dworshak	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Eaton	Lambertson	Stefan
Elliot, Calif.	Lanham	Stevenson
Elston	Lea	Stratton
Englebright	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.

Sutphin	Treadway	Wigglesworth
Taber	Vorys, Ohio	Wolcott
Talbot	Wadsworth	Wolfenden, Pa.
Talle	Ward	Woodruff, Mich.
Tenerowicz	Wasielewski	Youngdahl
Thill	Wheat	
Thomas, Tex.	Whittington	

NOT VOTING—142

Baldwin	Haines	O'Toole
Barry	Harness	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Pearson
Beckworth	Hart	Pfeifer,
Blackney	Harter	Joseph L.
Bland	Hébert	Plauché
Bolton	Heffernan	Powers
Boykin	Hendricks	Randolph
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman	Robertson,
Brown, Ohio	Hook	N. Dak.
Buck	Houston	Robison, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Izac	Rockefeller
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarrett	Rogers, Okla.
Burch	Jenkins, Ohio	Romjue
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Sacks
Burgin	Johnson,	Sasscer
Byrne	Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Kefauver	Schaefer, Ill.
Casey, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Schuetz
Celler	Kennedy,	Schulte
Clark	Martin J.	Scott
Clason	Kennedy,	Secrest
Cluett	Michael J.	Shannon
Coffee, Nebr.	Kecgh	Sheridan
Cole, Md.	Kilday	Sikes
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Smith, Wash.
Collins	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Crosser	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Landis	Starnes, Ala.
Davis, Ohio	Larrabee	Sweeney
Delaney	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	McGehee	Tinkham
Dies	McKeough	Traynor
Douglas	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	Maciejewski	Vreeland
Ellis	Marcantonio	Walter
Faddis	Merritt	Weaver
Fenton	Miller	Weiss
Fish	Mills, Ark.	Wene
Fogarty	Mitchell	West
Forand	Murray	Whelchel
Ford, Leland M.	Myers, Pa.	Williams
Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wilson
Gifford	O'Day	Winter
Gilchrist	O'Leary	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette	Oliver	Woodrum, Va.
Green	Osmer	Worley

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Miller.
Mr. West with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Williams.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Smith of Washington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TARVER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I rise to move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. It was my purpose to offer a motion as I have done in connection with the same subject matter on previous occasions. I had risen for the purpose of offering a motion to further insist upon the dis-

agreement of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 90 and 91. I wish to inquire whether or not I am privileged, as chairman of the House conferees, to offer that motion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my motion is to further insist.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet before the gentleman from Missouri rushed over between me and the microphone and offered his motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is a long-established rule of procedure that when a vital motion made by the Member in charge of a bill is defeated, the right to prior recognition passes to the opposition. That is the position in which the gentleman finds himself. He has made a major motion. The motion has been defeated. Therefore the right of recognition passes to the opposition, and I ask to be recognized to move to further insist.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard with regard to that statement?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The question has never been raised so far as I have known in the course of my experience of some 16 years upon an appropriation bill conference report, but if as the gentleman states the right of making the motion passes to the opposition, it should pass to my Republican colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] with whom the gentleman from Missouri has been associated in the defeat of the motion offered by the chairman of the subcommittee. I have desired to offer the motion myself in the absence of the exercise of that privilege by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. TARVER. I have completed all I desire to say except that I desire to offer the motion if it is permissible; otherwise, I insist that the right should pass to the opposition and to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman from Missouri has been properly recognized to offer a motion. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93. On page 86, line 16, strike out "\$3,341,182" and insert "\$3,295,575."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 93.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. Amendments No. 95 and No. 96 relating to the appropriation for the Farm Se-

curity Administration and to the loan provisions for the Farm Security Administration may, in my judgment, be considered together. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 83, line 3, strike out "\$25,319,557" and insert "\$50,319,557."

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 88, line 9, strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motions, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 95 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$37,819,557."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 96 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$97,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not desire to unduly impose upon the patience of the House at this late hour in the day. I hope that the House will bear with me for a moment as I undertake to explain the situation which exists with reference to these two amendments and the action which is being sought at your hands by the motions which I have submitted.

Last year the direct appropriations for grants and rural rehabilitation, and administration expenses was approximately \$64,000,000. The Budget estimate for the present fiscal year for this item is \$50,319,557, which amount the House reduced by \$25,000,000, cutting it substantially half in two. Since that time the President has submitted an additional Budget estimate for some \$14,000,000 plus, in addition to the \$50,000,000 plus, which had been first recommended. Therefore, the House figures are substantially \$39,000,000 below the Budget request of approximately \$64,000,000.

With regard to the loan provision, the Budget estimate at the time the House considered the bill was \$75,000,000 and your subcommittee reduced that by \$5,000,000, making the amount \$70,000,000. Since that time the President has submitted an additional Budget request and recommended in addition to the \$75,000,000 as originally submitted, \$105,000,000 plus, making a total for loans as recommended by the Budget of \$180,000,000 plus. The Senate fixed the amount at \$125,000,000, which is substantially \$55,000,000 below the Budget. The House figure having been \$70,000,000, it is sought by this motion to effect a compromise between the House figure and the Senate figure of \$125,000,000, making the amount of loans \$97,500,000 instead of \$180,000,000 plus as recom-

mended by the Budget, a reduction below the Budget of more than \$80,000,000.

With regard to the item of direct appropriation, the motion submitted is also a compromise motion, and proposes to split the difference between the House and the Senate figures which would still leave the amount provided in this item some twenty-six million or twenty-seven million dollars below the amount of the Budget estimate. That is all I care to say except to call attention to the language of the Budget estimate approved by the President, in which the request was transmitted for the additional \$105,000,000 for loans, and \$14,778,000 more for administrative expenses, and it is as follows:

"In order to stimulate the production of food for the more efficient prosecution of the war effort there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$14,778,000 in addition to the foregoing sum of \$50,319,557 for the same purposes and to be available for the same objects and to be expendable under the same conditions, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to advance \$105,500,000 in addition to the foregoing sum of \$75,000,000 for the same purposes and objects and under the same conditions."

The additional appropriation and loan authorization are requested as a part of the food-for-freedom program. In order to meet our food requirements and those of our Allies, it is clearly apparent that every effort must be made to increase our production of agricultural commodities to the fullest possible extent. No farmer should be precluded from doing his part because of lack of credit. To this end the Department of Agriculture has informed both private and Federal credit agencies of our food needs and urged their maximum cooperation in the extension of the necessary credit. However, notwithstanding the facilities presently available, there are thousands of low-income farmers who cannot obtain sufficient credit to participate fully in the food-for-freedom program.

Studies of the Department of Agriculture reveal that, even with all other farm groups operating at maximum production, the production of the low-income farm group is vitally needed to assist us in reaching the food-production goals required for the successful prosecution of the war. It, therefore, proposes a strong attack on this problem which will make use of the facilities of the Farm Security Administration and will quickly and effectively reach the maximum number of low-income farmers with guidance, supervision, and adequate credit.

The foregoing supplemental estimate of the appropriation and the authorization pertaining to the item of appropriation contained in the Budget for 1943 are to provide for contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1943. I recommend that they be transmitted to Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Your Commander in Chief has called upon you for approval of loans for the Farm Security Administration program, aggregating over \$180,000,000. We are asking you by this compromise motion to approve loans only for \$97,500,000. He asked you to approve administrative expenses, grants, and rural rehabilitation to the extent of \$64,000,000. We are asking you by this compromise motion to approve such items only to the extent of

\$37,000,000, plus. The amendment is offered as a compromise. It does not, in all respects, represent my views. I think it is offered with the approval of four members of the conferees. We are anxious, as I have indicated earlier, to complete consideration of this bill by the 1st of July, and it is hoped that the amendment as submitted may be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Upon request of the ranking member on the gentleman's own side, we are attempting to cut this time down.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I was not any party to that kind of a request.

Mr. TARVER. I understand; but the House is tired and it is getting late, and I think that is fair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman took 5 minutes, and there is no reason why the minority should not have 5 minutes. That is only fair.

Mr. TARVER. I do not desire to be unfair to the gentleman. I am trying to conform to what I believe to be the wishes of the House. If I yield the gentleman 5 minutes, I have to yield perhaps to several other gentlemen time in proportion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But there is a matter of \$50,000,000 involved here. I am willing to stay here a half an hour or more for that much. Will not the gentleman yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is involved in this motion \$12,500,000 in cash and \$27,000,000 in loan authority. As I said before, that is no chicken feed. I am willing to stay here as long as it takes and fight it out on this line, because that is substantial money in my language.

I am opposed to this proposal. I am opposed to this compromise, because I think it is wrong. I think this is one of the most wasteful and extravagant organizations that has ever existed in the history of this Republic. It is rather funny that they talk about foods for freedom, and about the new food goals, when as early as September Secretary Wickard revised the schedule upward. Nine months later they come in before the Senate with a supplemental estimate. Where were they all the time if that was so important?

It is a duplicate organization. They have had 17,000 on the pay roll for last year. That is the equivalent of five infantry regiments. Home advisers; farm advisers, in duplication with the Extension Service of the country; area agents; district agents; county agents; going everywhere and advising, for which they have expended \$18,500,000 on personnel last year. They have had \$741,000,000 since they have been in business for loans and grants. That is over a period of 6½ years—\$741,000,000 for

loans and grants. Do you know how much it took to administer that. It took \$276,000,000. Think of it: Loans and grants \$741,000,000, and their pay roll, supplies, and travel account has been \$276,000,000. There is no business that could exist under God's canopy under that kind of basis except the Federal Government. They spent \$198,000,000 for salaries to administer \$741,000,000 in loans and grants. And are they travelers? They have spent \$29,000,000 for travel since they have been doing business.

Are you going to put the seal of approval on that sort of business and give them another \$12,500,000 in cash and another \$27,000,000 in loan authority? O. K., but I am not. I am willing to stay here all night in order to resist this sort of thing, because I think it is extravagant. I think it is wasteful. I think it is mismanaged. I think it is done under the tutelage and philosophy of Rexford Tugwell, of whom Mr. Baldwin, the Administrator, was a disciple. We had to take him over the coals in the committee no end of times, and admonish the gentleman that this country was not yet ready for socialism.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. There has been pending before the Rules Committee an application for a rule on a resolution to investigate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They need it.

Mr. COX. The record made by this outfit, the Farm Security Administration, has been such as should convince anybody that it ought to be liquidated. The idea that it is on its way out is the reason why that resolution has not been reported. The record of the Farm Security Administration is the worst of any agency ever set up by the Government.

There are many things about the Farm Security Administration which bear a bad odor.

Now, they talk about more milk and more meat and more food for freedom. I have here a list of eight cheese factories in Illinois that were closed last week because they have crowded down the price, and because the warehouses are full in Chicago.

There is, therefore, no outlet for the farmer's milk, and the consequence is that they in some areas get \$1.25 a hundred and cannot even produce milk for that; and yet they talk about producing more milk and more cheese when, as a matter of fact, our cheese factories are shutting down. I am reliably informed that 47 cheese factories have closed down in the last couple of weeks, but I have a list of only 8.

Are you going to put the seal of approval upon an administrative item of \$50,000,000 to go out and teach people to do this, that, and the other thing when there is no hope of disposing of what they produce? I am not.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to say this to the gentleman and for the benefit of the membership, that I have two

Carnation Milk factories in my district, two Pet Milk factories, and several small cheese factories. While the farmers have been encouraged to increase their production, they cannot now get cost of production for their products; nor can the milk haulers secure tires from the O. P. A. to haul milk to these factories.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is time we ended this business of spending \$1 in administrative expense for virtually every \$2 of help extended, and I am not going along on a proposition of that kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it be something bad to enable the really poor group of farmers in this country to purchase enough livestock to balance their farming operations, to enable them to get the seed they need to take their part in the production of the food we and our Allies desperately need; in fact, if it be bad policy to enable those people to be better farmers than they were before and to give them a chance to get a decent living, then this is a bad proposition. It is somewhat appalling to me that every time we consider a proposition that really helps poor people someone gets up on the floor and attacks it. As a matter of actual fact, the so-called administrative expenses the gentleman from Illinois referred to include not only the servicing of the loans and the assistance of these farmers in working out their farm problems but it also includes many other things, some of which the Farm Security Administration has been directed to do because of the war itself. The job it does in attempting to mobilize and move about in mobile camps farm labor is one of the most necessary jobs there is to be done right now. All that expense is included in what the gentleman calls administrative expense. As a matter of fact, the answer to all the gentleman complains about as to why we have had an accumulation of certain farm products is that we have not been able to ship the things as rapidly as was expected. I myself have proposed on this floor what ought to be the answer to that; namely, we should have a means of getting that food into the hands of the people of this country who need it. We have figures coming out of the Federal Security Agency about undernourishment—there are 9,000,000 undernourished children in the country. There is where some of these surpluses should go—purchased from the farmers under section 32 at a parity price. The item we have here now applies to a group composing about 40 percent of the farmers of America. They have in the past produced but 12 percent of the total farm output. But they are and have been counted upon to account for 40 percent of the increased production of eggs, 50 percent of the increased production of tomatoes, 35 percent of the increased production of pork which is needed in connection with the food-for-freedom program. These figures are only examples.

Mr. Speaker, if the membership is going to say that they can pass an appro-

priation bill for \$40,000,000,000—forty thousand million dollars—for necessary military expenses connected with direct combat with the enemy, but that you cannot spare \$40,000,000 for the purpose of substantially increasing the production of necessary food in the only section of your farm population where any large increase in production is possible, then I think your program is indeed illogical. After all, it has been said that food will win the war; in fact, we know it is the first and most primary element, and here is the only program offered you which can result in substantially increasing food products.

Why should we not protect small agriculture? I am interested not only in protecting the small business man but also in protecting the small farmer. Let the small family-size farm operator produce as much as he can now, when he has a chance to make a little money. Let the little farmer make a little bit of money and put himself in a position where he can keep his farm when the war is over, for the whole future of America depends on our always having an agriculture that is carried on by men who own family-size farms. When we lose that we shall have lost one of the three or four most basic elements of democracy itself.

For these reasons I shall support the motion of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in total war. And we are losing the war. In the last week the enemy has broken through the Russian front and have taken some of the strongest positions. In Africa they have driven back the Allied forces and are striking at vital objectives. They have taken Sumatra, Burma, the Indies, and the Philippines and are sweeping the gallant Chinese back in critical retreats. They have occupied, and are holding, territory in continental America. We are fighting on our own doorstep and their U-boats are patrolling Atlantic waters at the gates to our coastal cities. And yet at this time of gravest national peril, when we are straining every national resource to meet the enemy, we are confronted with this amendment to use money we have not got for such a purpose as this.

The Ways and Means Committee has just completed the draft of the revenue bill. And it is two and a half billion dollars short of the mark set by the Treasury. The request was for a measure that would provide eight and a half billion dollars. The bill as drawn will raise only \$6,000,000,000. We are two and a half billion dollars short and yet we are asked to fritter away over a hundred million dollars additional on this one item. Remember we are already making a large appropriation for this purpose. But the Senate amendment and the gentleman's motion want to add to it over a hundred million dollars.

We need that hundred million dollars in planes and tanks and guns. We need

it right now on the Russian front. We need it desperately this afternoon on the African front. We need it, and more, on the Chinese front—not to mention Alaska, San Francisco, and New York.

I appeal to the House to vote down this amendment and use this money to equip our men—use it to win the war.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman from Kansas tell the House what the position of the leading farm organizations are with reference to this particular item?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The National Grange and the Farm Bureau are unequivocally opposed to this. I have two letters here bearing this out from the national leaders of the two great farm organizations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Napoleon said that the Army travels on its belly. We were told in the last war that food will win the war. May I say to the Members of the House that this is one of the most important appropriations that we have in this bill. I wish I had more time so I could tell you what the Farm Security organization has been doing in the State of Idaho. I would like to tell you how they came in and saved the great apple industry by making loans to the apple growers when a freeze had taken their crop and there was no other source open to them to get money. I would like to tell you how they are going into the cut-over land district and assisting the farmers in making two blades of grass where one grew before. I would like to tell you how much more cream and butter is brought into our creameries by the people who were assisted by this Administration.

We are in a great war. Our theater of operations will probably be in the Pacific. We have a bottleneck through the Rocky Mountains which prevents us from getting food from the Eastern States to the Pacific area. The Farm Administration has gone into the Northwest and assisted the farmers and is helping these people. This money will go directly into the production of food. It will increase the number of cows on the farm, it will increase the number of chickens, it will increase the amount of butter and eggs.

I have not time in 2 minutes to tell you the whole story of what it has done, but this is an important appropriation and I hope the House will support the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes in conclusion of the debate to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if I can persuade anyone to change his view upon this matter, but I shall assume that there are some who still have an open mind on this matter and who will listen to argument.

I am supporting the position of my chairman in regard to this amendment. The conferees divided fifty-fifty. We can settle this matter for this year at least by adopting the motion offered by the chairman of the conference committee. I do not agree with the two brilliant and distinguished members of the conference, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN.] I differ widely with them. In the first place, may I say that the gentleman from Illinois who always makes a stirring, and if you are interested in figures, a persuasive argument, occasionally in a burst of oratory and in the passion of argument he overstates his facts and he sometimes uses language that in a calmer moment I am sure he would not use. His reference today to Farm Security is wholly unjustified. Mr. C. B. Baldwin, Administrator, is an outstanding patriotic American, a man of rare courage. He is the type of American that made this Nation great and to whom we must depend upon to preserve it now and in the future.

Here is an agency that far from having a bad odor has rendered a service to the American farmer through the years of depression that is superior to any other relief agency that we have had in that field and, mark you, the money involved now, the major amount of money, is money, again I repeat, as I said concerning the farm-tenancy proposition, that comes back. It is a loan to the low-income farmer. Do you think that it would have had the endorsement in the last week of these organizations if it did not have merit?

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers' Union; Murray Lincoln, executive secretary; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; J. G. Luhrs, executive secretary, American Railway Executives Association; Monsgr. L. G. Ligutti, executive secretary, National Catholic Rural Life Association; and Benson Y. Landis, Federal Council of Churches.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has mentioned the names of eminent labor leaders whose names are household words. I respect their opinions. But this is an agricultural bill. Can the gentleman also favor us with the opinions of farm leaders? What is the position of the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the great national farm organizations?

Mr. LEAVY. I have not been advised. The State Grange in the State of Washington is very much in favor of this. I favor it for no other reason than the fact that I have seen the apple industry in my district, an industry that had a value of a quarter of a billion dollars when the depression hit, put back on its feet. Today they are not asking Farm

Security for anything. They have repaid in large part the money. If we allow this money, we allow food for over 2,000,000 soldiers in at least five staple commodities, which is just so much food that would not be produced, if this appropriation is denied. Not only that, by this appropriation, we lift 300,000 liberty-loving American farm families to a standard where they have a degree of economic independence. The American way of life becomes a reality to them. It is these people who are furnishing some of the best young men to preserve America. The parents and brothers and sisters of these fine young soldiers are justly entitled to be permitted to do their part in this war effort, and at the same time enjoy the very limited security that will come from these funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A vote against the motion is a vote to sustain the position of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote against the pending motion is a vote for the defeat of the pending motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has made this motion without authorization by a majority of the managers on the part of the House, it is only fair that the House understand the effect of this vote. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if a vote against the pending motion is not a vote to sustain the position which the House took when it sent the bill to conference.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The question raised by the gentleman from Missouri is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 59, noes 120.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

One hundred and eight-five Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 119, nays, 156, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—119

Allen, La.	Hare	Pierce
Arnold	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Barden	Healey	Priest
Boggs	Hill, Wash.	Rabaut
Bonner	Holbrook	Ramsay
Brooks	Holland	Ramspeck
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Rankin, Miss.
Bryson	Hull	Richards
Burgin	Hunter	Rivers
Camp	Imhoff	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Carlson	Jarman	Russell
Cartwright	Johnson	Sabath
Claypool	Luther A.	Sanders
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Okla.	Sasser
Cooper	Kelly, Ill.	Sauthoff
Courtney	Kerr	Scruggs
Cunningham	Kirwan	Shanley
Curtis	Knutson	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kopplemann	Smith, Pa.
Dingell	Kramer	Snyder
Domengeaux	Lane	South
Downs	Lea	Sparkman
Eberharter	Leavy	Spence
Edmiston	McGranery	Stefan
Elliott, Mass.	McIntyre	Sutphin
Elliott, Calif.	McMillan	Tarver
Fitzgerald	MacIora	Tenerowicz
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Terry
Flaherty	Mahon	Thom
Flannagan	Manasco	Van Zandt
Folger	Mills, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Ford, Thomas F.	Mundt	Voorhis, Calif.
Gearhart	Murdoch	Ward
Gehrmann	Nichols	Welch
Gibson	Norrell	White
Gore	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Granger	O'Connor	Williams
Grant, Ala.	Patman	Wright
Gregory	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

NAYS—156

Allen, Ill.	Dworshak	Lesinski
Andersen	Eaton	Lewis
H. Carl	Elston	Ludlow
Anderson, Calif.	Engel	McGregor
Anderson	Englebright	McLaughlin
N. Mex.	Fellows	McLean
Andresen	Ford, Miss.	Martin, Iowa
August H.	Fulmer	Martin, Mass.
Angell	Gale	Mason
Arends	Gamble	May
Barnes	Gathings	Meyer, Md.
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Michener
Baumhart	Gillie	Monroney
Beiter	Gossett	Moser
Bell	Graham	Nelson
Bender	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Bennett	Guy	Pace
Bishop	Gwynne	Paddock
Bloom	Hall	Patton
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.
Butler	Halleck	Ploeser
Canfield	Hancock	Plumley
Cannon, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Poage
Carter	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Heldinger	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hill, Colo.	Rich
Chipherfield	Hinshaw	Robertson, Va.
Clevenger	Hobbs	Rockwell
Cochran	Holmes	Rodgers, Pa.
Colmer	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Jacobsen	Rolph
Copeland	Jenks, N. H.	Shafer, Mich.
Costello	Jennings	Short
Cox	Jensen	Simpson
Cravens	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Crawford	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Creal	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Va.
Culkin	Jones	Smith, Wis.
D'Alessandro	Jonkman	Springer
Day	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Keefe	Stevenson
Dirksen	Kilburn	Stratton
Disney	Kinney	Sullivan
Ditter	Kieberg	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Kunkel	Taber
Doughton	Lambertson	Talle
Duncan	Lanham	Thill
Durham	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.

Thomason	Wheat	Wolfenden, Pa.
Tibbott	Whitten	Woodruff, Mich.
Treadway	Whittington	Young
Vorys, Ohio	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl
Wasielewski	Winter	
West	Wolcott	

NOT VOTING—157

Andrews	Hall	O'Toole
Baldwin	Edwin Arthur	Patrick
Barry	Harness	Pearson
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Pfeifer
Beam	Hart	Joseph L.
Beckworth	Harter	Pheiffer
Blackney	Hébert	William T.
Bland	Heffernan	Plauché
Boehne	Hendricks	Powers
Bolton	Hess	Randolph
Boren	Hoffman	Rankin, Mont.
Boykin	Hook	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Houston	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	N. Dak.
Buck	Jenkins, Ohio	Robison, Ky.
Buckley, Minn.	Johns	Rockefeller
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Okla.
Burch	Johnson	Romjue
Burdick	Lyndon B.	Sacks
Byrne	Kee	Satterfield
Byron	Kefauver	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Kelley, Pa.	Schaefer, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schuetz
Casey, Mass.	Martin J.	Schulte
Celler	Kennedy	Scott
Clark	Michael J.	Secrest
Clason	Keogh	Shannon
Cluett	Kilday	Sheridan
Coffee, Nebr.	Klein	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Kocialkowski	Smith, Wash.
Cole, N. Y.	Landis	Smith, W. Va.
Collins	Larrabee	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Crowther	McCormack	Steagall
Cullen	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Ohio	McKeough	Sweeney
Delaney	Maas	Talbot
Dickstein	Maciejewski	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Mansfield	Tinkham
Douglas	Marcantonio	Tolan
Drewry	Merritt	Traynor
Ellis	Miller	Vincent, Ky.
Faddis	Mills, Ark.	Vreeland
Fenton	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Fish	Mott	Walter
Fogarty	Murray	Weaver
Forand	Myers, Pa.	Weiss
Ford, Leland M.	Norton	Wene
Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whelchel
Gifford	O'Day	Wilson
Gilchrist	O'Leary	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette	Oliver	Woodrum, Va.
Green	O'Neal	Worley
Haines	Osmer	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Boren with Mr. William T. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Johns.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Andrews.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Crowther.

Mr. Beam with Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. Tolman with Mrs. Byron.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 97: Page 89, line 7, insert "except for the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its

disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments that are still in disagreement and ask for a conference with the Senate and that conferees be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may be allowed to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of Carl L. Jones;

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and Agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of State.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. Federal Trade Commission.
5. The National Archives.
6. United States Civil Service Commission.
7. United States New York World's Fair Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made recently by Mr. Kyle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two articles from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the Charleston News and Courier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLBROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news item from a newspaper in Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Louis P. Lochner, on war transportation in Germany.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include a letter and in another a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the current issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be permitted to extend his remarks and include an article by Arthur Krock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 10 minutes.

ARMY AND NAVY METHOD OF PROCUREMENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the whole country as well as Members of Congress who have always had a high regard for the Army and Navy methods of procurement, and for the integrity and the traditions of the armed services, have been shocked by the accusations of "reckless spending" contained in the House Military Affairs

Committee report. This report was a strongly worded document, asserting "nearly every conceivable type of extravagant waste" had been discovered in its investigation of the War Department's business dealings.

This report was especially shocking and disquieting to those Members of Congress who have served on committees having to do with the affairs of the armed services. Not only have such Members come to have a high regard for the traditions of the military and naval services, the Marines and the Air Corps, but they have come to place great reliance on both the judgment and integrity of the officers charged with so administering the affairs of the armed services as to maintain those high traditions of efficiency, honesty, and courage.

It must be said in all fairness that under the conditions of haste, hysteria, and political cross-fire due to the condition of unpreparedness in which the United States was caught by the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Army and Navy officers are operating under the greatest handicaps they have ever had to contend with in any war in which this country has been engaged. The very conditions—not to mention the predilections of many of the bureaus in the administrative departments of the Government—have made for waste and extravagance. It is only fair to say further that time is of the essence in the job of fighting a war while trying to prepare the means by which the war can be fought. The fact we were unprepared for this conflict when we were launched into it by the attack on Pearl Harbor was most distinctly not the fault of the military or naval officials charged with the responsibility of being ready for war. They could go no further than higher authority would permit. These officers were frank to the fullest extent possible with both the executive officials and the committees of Congress in the information they gave as to the unprepared condition of America. It should be remembered that it was the Chief of Staff himself, Gen. George C. Marshall, who on May 17, 1940, disclosed to a Senate committee our complete and shocking unpreparedness. It is obvious to any fair-minded person that the old adage, "Haste makes waste," is especially applicable to our present national situation.

All of this is not to say that the House Military Affairs Committee report was not justified, or was not constructive. It must be said that if the report was justified, it was constructive. The members of the committee who rendered the report are the best judges of its justification. Those Members of Congress who have always had such a high regard for the Army and Navy method of doing things, feel sure—and they most ardently hope—that not only will the Army clean up very promptly any weak spots in its efficiency, the waste spots in its spending, and expunge and punish those responsible for any spots which indicate anything worse than inefficiency, but that the Navy will do likewise.

The Congress and the country must be careful to make a clear-cut distinction

between waste which is the inevitable result of haste and waste which may result from neglect, indifference, inefficiency, or worse.

This is a gravely serious question, because the whole Nation must depend, in the final analysis, upon the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Any justified weakening in the public confidence in the military and naval services would be a tragedy of inexpressible proportions and effect to the United States of America. The services must be kept above suspicion of waste, extravagance, inefficiency, or unfair dealings. The grand traditions of both branches of the service must be maintained in their highest form. Whatever basis may exist for the report of the House Military Affairs Committee must promptly be removed. The Nation must stand solidly behind its armed services, and those services must deserve to the fullest extent the confidence reposed in them by the people.

I am one Member of Congress who most firmly believes that both services will profit by the criticisms which have been expressed and that they will, under all circumstances, rise to the great heights of unselfish devotion they have heretofore bestowed upon their country.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for 5 minutes.

THE RED CROSS BILL AND VESTED RIGHTS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but I believe the House should be informed of the progress made to date on the bill to protect the Red Cross name and emblem from commercial exploitation.

On April 3, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress asking action on a bill "designed the more effectively to carry out our obligations under the Red Cross Convention of 1929" by barring commercial use of the name and emblem in the United States in a year. The message, draft bill, and report from Sumner Welles were referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and our chairman, Representative Bloom, introduced the bill, H. R. 6911.

Elaborate hearings were conducted. Representatives of the American Red Cross, among them the Honorable Norman Davis, chairman, and Miss Mabel Boardman, secretary, and representatives of the State Department, Department of Justice, and the Surgeon General's Office testified in favor of the bill. The principal commercial users testified at length. We learned that there are about seven of these, basing their rights on use prior to 1905 under existing law. Each commercial user feels it has a vested right to use the Red Cross name and emblem to identify its own goods; each commercial user spoke highly of the American Red Cross and protested that it wanted to cooperate in the work of the American Red Cross, but not one of them has ever advertised that it was not connected with the American Red Cross or that its goods were not en-

dorsed by the American Red Cross, although this is the fact.

One commercial user suggested that the commercial advertising was beneficial to the Red Cross, but none of them suggested that Congress should expand the commercial use of the label to more products and additional companies, in order to help the American Red Cross. There was no evidence of commercial use of the Red Cross in America before 1864, when the International Red Cross was founded, or before 1881, when the American Red Cross Society was incorporated by Congress.

We learned that no other English-speaking country permits the commercial use of the Red Cross and that such use in our country has caused international protests. Toward the end of the hearings, our chairman received an additional letter from the President urging favorable action on the bill and saying "To great numbers of loyal Americans it seems almost a sacrilege for any person for private material benefit to use an emblem created by international agreement solely for humane purposes," and letters urging action were received from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Attorney General. On May 27 the public hearings closed. The last committee meeting on the bill was held last Tuesday.

H. R. 6911 seems to be dead, as a new bill has been introduced, including the White Cross of Switzerland, and two more "committee prints" have been studied. I have been assured that all of our committee want to help the American Red Cross, but questions about treaties, history, trade-marks, constitutional law and vested rights seem to keep coming up to perplex, divide, confuse, and delay the committee. We find it impossible to draft a bill that will protect the Red Cross from commercial exploitation and still permit its exploitation.

After nearly 3 months this bill, backed by the President and four Cabinet members as required to carry out our international obligations and to further the war effort, is still in committee. No further committee meetings have been announced and recess is coming on.

This is all the progress I can report on the Red Cross bill.

Speaking for myself, I would like to see the American Red Cross name and emblem protected by prompt action on this bill; I believe in considering vested rights even in wartime, although we have destroyed overnight the "vested rights" of many businesses and businessmen in our war effort, but I believe no one has a vested right in the good will of another, and particularly, no one has a vested right to label and advertise his goods, directly or indirectly, as connected with or endorsed by this great international institution of mercy and aid to the suffering; I believe the International Red Cross and the American Red Cross, with its 29,000,000 members and 3,000,000 voluntary workers, have a vested right in the emblem under which they serve—a right to have no man profit commercially from its use.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma filed a conference report and statement on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAINES, for 5 days, on account of being indisposed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 337. An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of E. P. Corley;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Execu-

tive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941;

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 30, for consideration of H. R. 7153, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7143. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; with amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7286. A bill authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 7297. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War,"

approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans," and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war; with amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 925. An act for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 7310. A bill to amend section 12b of the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the deduction of certain credits from assessments due Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by certain insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7311. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 511 Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 6999) for the extension of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and construction of a barge channel across northern Florida; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Res. 512. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript of an article showing that the vote cast by Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, was the deciding factor in the election of Thomas Jefferson as the third President of the United States, be printed as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for Thy goodness to us and to all men. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God." Enable us, we pray Thee, to enter into our heritage as Thy children and to enter into our heritage as the leaders and citizens of a great country. Help us, O God,

to keep our Nation great—great in character, great in truth, and great in righteousness.

Guide, we beseech Thee, the deliberations of this body that with wisdom, courage, and fidelity we may do our work, avoiding all selfishness, seeking ever for cooperation and looking unto Thee, the source of all our being and the goal of our highest endeavor.

In the hour of high decision, be Thou our guide and in our inmost souls be Thou our Saviour and friend. We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7181. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2565. An act to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended;

S. 2599. An act authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes; and

S. 2604. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River.

ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SELECT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7297) authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.